THE CHURCHMAN.

VOLUME XV.—No. 8. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii. 15. WHOLE NUMBER 736.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS. NEW-YORK: SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1845. BY JAMES A. SPARKS, 161 FULTON-ST. { Terms—$3 00 per annum—in advance.

Communications.

For the Churchman.

Trial of Bishops—No. 4.

Mr. Editor,—Notwithstanding I may be thought to have advanced already reasons enough in behalf of limiting the time which may transpire between the act of an accused party and the occurrence of his trial, I venture to trouble you with a few additional reflections of a like nature and object.

Such limitation is rendered necessary by the growth of prejudice. Suppose the offence to have existence only in the construction of the complaining person: and suppose the construction to be induced by some notion to the prejudice of the alleged offender previously entertained. It would be hard for the individual to be brought to trial even immediately. The mere fact of being charged with such an offence must cause him much anguish and occasion him to suffer greatly in public estimation. Even at that early stage of the unpleasant business, it might be difficult for him to rebut the testimony which receives not only its shades and coloring, but also its very form, and being from a feeling or persuasion on the part of the witness, that the accused is capable of what is laid to his charge. But how much worse for him to be arraigned after the prejudice, having been nourished by daily feeding, has a thousand times confirmed the injurious impression to which it first gave rise! The witness has had a species of gratification in reviewing the particulars which justify the dislike that he had at first encouraged: and every time the review is had, he is rendered more disposed to give the utmost possible strength to his allegations. After the lapse of many years he is brought by this action of the mind upon itself, this constant endeavor to indulge and justify his animosity, to an unwavering conviction which, at the time of the alleged occurrence, he could not have tolerated. At that earlier day he would have allowed the accused the benefit of some doubts; but now his declarations are positive—it is not possible for him to see the least palliating circumstance. This is more certainly the case if between him and the person he accuses, there are differences of opinion on important subjects, leading to very essential differences in action. Every time his opponent does any thing contrary to his own ideas of correct principle or just expediency, his views of the original cause of offence receive an aggravation. He would be more than human if such were not the case. And hence it is justice to him no less than to the person he would injure, to cause him to bear his testimony within some specified and comparatively brief period after the occurrence of the act which has offended him, or to prevent his testifying altogether.

Since under our present canon for trying bishops, there is no provision for challenging any of the jurors on the ground of their having already made up their minds, or for similar causes, a portion of what has here been said applies as much to the triers of a cause as to the witnesses. For they also are capable of cultivating prejudices. Their minds likewise can be banefully influenced respecting a brother, by his official acts when they are opposed to their own convictions of right. And the longer you allow them to reflect upon these outrages, as they deem them, the more opportunity you allow for the recurrence of these by permitting the lapse of a considerable portion of time, the greater will be their unfitness to decide impartially upon a charge brought against the brother who has had the misfortune to encounter their dislike.

Let us get the light afforded for this subject by the case of Bishop Onderdonk. Mrs. Butler testifies that notwithstanding her long intimacy with the Respondent, she had a prejudice against him which caused her to deem him guilty of one impropriety on very slight appearance of evidence. How far may this prejudice have affected all the impressions of his conduct adopted during her ride? How much may it have confirmed those impressions in the many reflections she has had during the more than seven years which have since elapsed? She and her husband are known to be strenuous advocates of opinions opposed to those maintained by him whom they accuse. Some of his many public acts have met with their decided and loud disapprobation. How much may these differences and this disapprobation have altered their previous views of the transaction on which they cause him to be arraigned? An earlier summons before an ecclesiastical court would have given him the chance of fairer testimony from them. But now he must suffer not only for his incautious attempts to administer kind attentions to one whom he regarded as a daughter and professing to be ill, but also for all the aggravating additions to his conduct which the prejudices of herself and husband and their dislike of his views and official acts are calculated to impart. Their prejudices have had years to grow in; and in the case of the husband, at least, there has been all the extra nourishment derivable from a frequent repetition of the story of his grievance.

The Misses Rudderow also had a prejudice against the Bishop which was calculated to cause their most unfavorable construction of the acts towards themselves of which they complain. Such must have been its continued and increasing operation that every year their testimony was delayed added something to the complexion it ultimately assumed. The existence of their prejudice is incidentally made known by the publication by the Rev. J. C. Richmond of a letter received from one of them months before the trial. In that letter the Bishop is alluded to under the title of "Pope Benjamin I." That one phrase is as expressive as a volume could be of their view of his theological opinions and official acts. Were they who were capable of using it likely to avoid the constant growth of the unfavorable impression respecting which they have had to testify? Would they not have been likely to have testified with much more charity had they been examined before, through the intervention of many months, their dislike of other parts of the Bishop's conduct had contributed materially to strengthen and increase their previous notions of injury and wrong?

And how is the matter with the Bishops? Have not the events of seven years very much impaired the fitness of some of them to be judges in this cause? A few years since certain differences in sentiment would have been likely to have unduly influenced their minds. Still we could have trusted them because of their known disposition to do right. But since then much has transpired which has altered their relation to their brother. Some of his acts have actually exasperated them. A prominent and almost unavoidable consequence has been the strengthening of their previous impressions against him to so great a degree, that with the best intentions, they have not been able to do him justice. Had a limitation been provided for, the trial if it had taken place at all, would have occurred before their minds had been so unprepared for the administration of equity by the circumstances and conduct which have since excited their disgust and ire. If there is the least reason to apprehend that they were unduly biased on the painful occasion referred to, it makes one of many arguments against delaying our trials, and for a statute of limitation.

Much might be added to the view thus far maintained, by referring to the effect of the imagination permitted to dwell for a series of years on any particular incident. It would be easy to prove that every additional year makes a wider difference between the impressions of an imaginative person and the truth. But I have already devoted so much space to this branch of our discussion that I deem it best to forego the advantage of pressing this fair and very strong argument. The mention of it must suffice.

In like manner and for a corresponding reason, do I refrain from dwelling upon our duty to make some provision whereby an offender may, like St. Peter for example, have the benefit of repentance and amendment. It is obvious that some such provision should be made: for the worst men may reform; and the worst certainly should have the benefit of their reformation. If we deny room for contrition, and exclude from mercy and protection all who sin, we essentially contradict the Gospel, make war upon its provisions, and render the Church, in an important respect, unmindful of the example of Christ.

But I must forbear. I believe I have said enough to prove that a statute of limitation is indispensable. Perhaps I have said enough to prove also that for want of such a statute the recent trial, although conducted as we hope with the best intentions, could not have been fair. I will trust, Mr. Editor, that nothing will make it necessary to have another presentment of a Bishop: but if any such necessity shall exist, I pray that it may not be until after our present oppressive canon be altered. The sacrifice of one Bishop to it is quite as much as it deserves.

Unus.

For the Churchman.

Discipline—No. 3.

We are, then, brought back to the foundation of all law, opinion, universal and imperative. We have shown, by a plain example, that public opinion here supports the verdict of the Church, when, elsewhere, it does not do so. We have shown that it is because it is, upon certain matters of discipline, universal and authoritative, and therefore gives the clergyman in this country, as far as regards these matters, the requisites which are necessary to the exercise of the judicial power vested in him by his commission. Now we ask, if there were in the Church opinion of the same kind, that is, universal, necessary, and practical, would not the same result ensue? Would not this produce authoritative legislation, and this again practical action? Certainly it would. Now we ask, is this opinion in the Church? The very principles of Spiritual Law, upon which our discipline must be founded, are they acknowleged universally, and practically held by all? If they are not, then adieu to discipline, or any hope of it, until the Spiritual Law upon which discipline must rest is so acknowledged and so held.

However, as to the matter of fact upon the subject, we shall give another quotation from the article before cited, and we believe every one will acknowledge it to be a true representation.

"Again—we have, in Maryland, and we believe in other dioceses, a canon declaring for what offences a layman shall be tried. Has any layman ever been tried under this canon? We believe not. Why not? The answer to this and to the former question is plain; the laity will not endure discipline."

A layman would say, I care not whether I am excommunicated or not. If I am, I can still hear your preaching as much as I like; can hold, if I choose to pay for it, the best pew in your best Church, and sit in it as often as I please. But you are debarred, it might be said, from THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST. His reply might be, that he could receive the Lord's supper in some of the other denominations. But you would rejoin, that the other denominations were not the Church; that their communion was not THE COMMUNION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST; that membership with them was not membership in THE BODY OF CHRIST. He would at once say, he did not believe you. Here then we have reached the reason why there is no discipline for the laity. The laity will not submit to discipline, because they want faith in one of the articles of "the Christian faith, as contained in the Apostle's Creed."—They do not "believe in the Holy Catholic Church."

This extract we think contains solid truths; a clear statement of the immediate cause for the want of discipline; a clear statement, also, of the reason why that canon is operative. Now the reader will observe the immediate cause in the Pew-system, and the ideas suggested by it. "I can pay for the best pew in your best Church, sit in it as often as I please, and hear your preaching as much as I like." Here is the Pew-system as the immediate cause; and whatever sentiments he may profess, manifestly the leading idea in his mind is his right to sit in the pew his money has paid for. His feeling of pride arises mainly from his right to pay for a pew, and therefore to enjoy his privileges consequent thereupon. That, then, which lies at the bottom of this is "want of faith," he does not believe in the Catholic Church." And yet the man has recited the article a thousand times! He has given his assent and consent to it so often! he has heard sermons upon it! why does he not believe in it then? Let us go back and we find the reason. "He does not believe in the BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST." For asserting is not believing, assenting is not believing, as we know by our own experience; remembering a period of our life in which, as often as we had repeated and assented to the scriptural truth in the Nicene Creed, "One baptism for the remission of sins," we considered then that we believed this, and yet we did not. For faith is a practical thing, and the faith that is not acted upon, and thereby realized, is no faith at all. Now the man here instanced does not believe in "the Holy Catholic Church," and this because he does not believe in "the body and blood of Christ" practically and really. He does not realize that it is any privilege.

Now let us recal the principles upon which our excommunication is founded,—it is an expulsion from the communion by which, as an instrument and means of grace the faithful recipients are made partakers spiritually of the body and blood of Christ. This, then, is the minus of union with the Church which is His body; the deprival of this is the deprival of the privileges of that Church. The two truths, the "Holy Catholic Church" and the communion of the body and blood of our Lord spiritually are thus connected; the one realizes as it were the other, and brings closer home to the believing heart that which to men of the world seems only an unreality, a high theoretic abstracted notion.* If the man had practical faith in the one article he would have it in the other.

The sacrament is the symbol of unity in the body of the Holy Catholic Church—it is that which brings closely home to the minds of the communicants their abidance and continuance in Him whose body the Church is.

And taking the very lowest of Church views *it is a means of grace,* of a peculiar and special grace attached to itself when received in faith, of a grace that can be attained in no other way than sacramentally, whether by prayer, preaching, or any other means. This is the opinion of the Church embodied in her articles and homilies, her liturgy and catechism. If this opinion were held universally could such a case as is supposed above occur or such reasoning be used? Every one sees it could not. If it were held we should have discipline, for opinion necessary and universal, and practical, is the foundation of law—makes law. And this is the reason why we have no discipline. We have not such a faith or opinion upon the very articles we confess with our words which are the basis of discipline.

Well, then, the layman is to blame for not believing—certainly, but not for the non-existence of discipline; for the opinion must be universal that is the foundation of law, and he is but an individual. The blame is in the Church. For why should our laity *believe that the eucharist is a means of grace!* Honestly for myself I do not see why they should. Our practice declares the contrary, that it is not such. If we believed it "to be a means of grace," it would not come in once a month or once in three months, but form a regular part of the services of each Lord's day, as it was among the holy men of old that believed in "the Holy Catholic Church." It would be a stated part of the services instead of an addition to them when the clergyman is fatigued and the congregation wearied out. It would, according to the very formation of our liturgy, be a noonday service for the communicants only.† But all this it is not. And the consequence is that the practice of the Church preaches against the doctrine that the Eucharist is a means of grace. No wonder, then, that the laity do not think it so; no wonder that they act upon that opinion which our practice originates in them. No wonder that there is no discipline when the very doctrine upon which discipline is founded is, instead of being necessary, universal and practical, is rendered voluntary, partial and theoretical. Restore, then, the foundation of the law and you restore the law itself and all action upon it. Let us have the Eucharist weekly as a part of the stated services of the Lord's day, and soon shall originate discipline in the Church. Without it we shall be as we are at the present time. And the movement towards it, if I rightly appreciate the position and duties of the clergy and laity, must come from the laity, must come from their appreciation of the value of the primitive practice and their desire for its restoration.

W. A.

For the Churchman.

I do not doubt, Mr. Editor, that Bishop Onderdonk would gladly make any personal sacrifice for the welfare of his diocese, but his interests and those of his diocese are not alone concerned in the matter; many of the considerations connected therewith, are of no local or temporary restriction; they involve the Church throughout the United States, and for all time; and the argument for present relief by his resignation, ought to have no weight if that relief is to be obtained by inducing evils of greater magnitude and more general extent. I earnestly hope that he will not suffer himself to be driven or persuaded into this measure, fraught, as it manifestly is, with consequences so injurious. He has been presented in a manner not contemplated by those who framed the canon; tried by an ex post facto law, intended to have no retrospective application; and condemned on evidence insufficient, in the judgment of impartial and intelligent men, to establish the charges preferred against him. There has been enough of irregularity, enough of harshness, enough of injustice and oppression. His persecutors have abundant reason to be satisfied with the misery and the mischief which they have wrought. Let them now come forward, and proclaim that vengeance is sated, and that they will acquiesce in the resumption of official duty by the bishop at the earliest possible period. In their eagerness to punish him they have inflicted a sad blow upon the diocese which he administered with so much wisdom and ability; and it is neither just nor manly to seek for escape from the grievous responsibility they have incurred, through the generosity of the individual whom they have so greatly injured. In the opinion of your correspondent the course both of the bishop and diocese is perfectly plain, and may be not inaptly expressed in the exhortation of the Jewish leader, "Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord."

The deprivation of Episcopal superintendance for one, three, or ten years, is nothing in comparison of the principles involved; and from those principles there should be no departure. The diocese owes its present anomalous position to extraneous agency, and is certainly not accountable for the consequences which may ensue. Let its members, clerical and lay—all who are worthy the name of Churchmen—rally around their bishop; bear patiently the burden which has been imposed upon them; and to those who are clamoring for his resignation, reply in the spirit and language of the Apostle of the Gentiles, "Nay, verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out."

To this clamor less importance would be attached, if some at least of those who are busiest in making it were better known to the Church. One of them, the Editor of the Recorder, is, though a clergyman, the author of an Address to the Laity on the subject of the Carey Ordination, *purporting to be written by a Layman;* and some years ago, when the present able Editor of the Banner of the Cross thought of relinquishing a charge which he had then only temporarily assumed, was exceedingly desirous to be appointed to the editorship of that paper; and the more readily to attain his object, spoke of the change which had taken place in his theological opinions, and declared his ability, and, in the event of his appointment, his intention so to conduct it, as to give satisfaction to Bishops H. U. Onderdonk, Doane, and Ives, between whom and their respective dioceses it was the official organ of communication!

A Layman.

For the Churchman.

Priest—Altar—Foundations.

Mr. Editor,—The Episcopal Recorder for April 5th, under the caption "Priest," congratulates our Church "that the foundations of our ecclesiastical system were laid by such venerable hands as those of White and Griswold,"—and also, that, of "the two distinct systems which now agitate the Church," that represented by Bishop Seabury was 'rejected with promptitude,' and the other as promptly adopted. The only illustration offered of these assertions is an extract from Bishop White's Memoirs of the Church, in which that very estimable prelate gives an opinion adverse to the word "priesthood" in the 9th of a set of Articles proposed in 1799, but not adopted,* where the term is applied to the whole ministry as a sacred body, not to the middle order distinctively.

Without touching the merits of any "system," I beg leave to offer some remarks on matters of fact concerning the true state of the case, and an argument or two than which facts can scarcely be more cogent.

Bishop Griswold was in no sense one of the 'founders of our ecclesiastical system.' The Prayer-book, to the end of the Psalter, was adopted in 1789, afterwards other Offices, the Articles in 1801, and, last of all, the Institution (at first called the Induction) Office in 1804 and 1808; whereas Dr. Griswold was not a member of the General Convention till 1811, in the House of Deputies, his consecration being shortly after, too late for him to take his place in the House of Bishops of that year. Nothing whatever has been done in or with our "system" since 1808; Bishop Griswold was the last man to assert or to recognise a claim of his having had any thing to do with these foundations. Moreover, Bishop Griswold had no prominence, beyond his diocese at least, till some ten or perhaps fifteen years after being consecrated. The acknowledged and effectively the sole leader in Church affairs in those days was Bishop Hobart; who entered on his eminent career before his consecration, which was simultaneous with that of Bishop Griswold; in 1799, he was Secretary to the House of Bishops; and he belonged to the General Conventions of 1801, 1804, and 1808, when the Articles and the Institution Office were placed in "the foundations of our ecclesiastical system." Of his attachment to the *priestly* cause there is the fullest evidence. With "foundations" Bishop Griswold had nothing to do, nothing whatever. And after they were laid, the influence of Bishop Hobart was tenfold the amount of his; and so it remains since their death, if acknowledgments on all sides are to be regarded.

That Bishop White was one of the 'founders' of our *Church,* as a branch of the Church Catholic, is known to all; but that he was a founder of "our ecclesiastical *system,*" as the phrase will be currently understood, is a very different proposition, perfectly true of anti-Calvinism, anti-stimulation, and the like, but not of the point before us. To the only material change from the English "system," that of adding the "Oblation" (particularly) and "Invocation" in our eucharistic office, regarded as eminently significant acts, he was opposed, and has placed his opposition on record; giving it his concurrence however, as, though called by him a "great change," yet involving necessarily in his opinion no modification of the then prevalent doctrine; a concession exceedingly remarkable, and which could only have been prompted by the imperative need of union among our infant churches, and by his gentle and (in many things) yielding temperament. (Memoirs P. E. C. p. 154.) No one who agreed to that alteration of the Liturgy "laid the foundation of the system" which the Recorder prefers to the other of "the two which now agitate the Church." Nor was it ever "founded" among us, i. e. reposited in our standards, however widely it may have continued to prevail among our clergy and people; which however it did less, for some thirty years after 1789, than in England. The non-sacrificial character of the eucharist, with the non-sacerdotal character of the ministry, has never been the "system" of our branch, any more than Arianism was, at a certain period, the "system" of the Church Catholic; the former contradicting the one by her liturgy, as the latter contradicted the other by her creed. What Bishop White claimed for his view, was, that the change in the communion service was not inconsistent with it, never that it furthered it: "he always thought there was a beauty in those ancient forms, and can discover no superstition in them." And but for this construction under the high authority of Bishop White, yet amounting only to private opinion though of the most eminent kind, the non-sacrificial and non-sacerdotal theory would not and *could not* have, in the American Church, a single candid voice in its favor. With that construction, it has many. But no construction can protect the assertion that the other theory was 'promptly rejected,' or "rejected" at all. On the contrary, Bishop Seabury, who was another of the founders of our Church, and *the* founder of this part of "our ecclesiastical system," had the satisfaction of seeing it readily adopted, in the first Convention of our *whole* community, and with the full knowledge that he, with others of the clergy, regarded it as embodying the complete sacrificial and sacerdotal doctrine of the eucharist.

Concerning the founding, and the influence in founding, this part of our "system," there is no doubt; the active founder was Bishop Seabury, and the influence that led him to the work was the belief in the sacrificial and sacerdotal doctrine. The share of Bishop White in the proceeding was but passive, passive acquiescence in a measure required for the harmonious "union" of our several dioceses; his opinion however being adverse to the doctrine, and as well-known as that of Bishop Seabury in its favor. The majority of the Convention voted for the change; whether many of them were sufficiently well-informed theologians to understand perfectly the competing doctrines, may be a speculative question; it is enough, for the practical and binding result, that the Convention represented our whole Church, and for our whole Church laid that "foundation of our ecclesiastical system," a foundation which has never since, for more than half a century, been authoritatively disturbed.

Intangibly respectable as are the individual opinions of these our first two fathers in God, Bishop Seabury and Bishop White, we are not left unaided to their opposite interpretations. The meaning of this part of the Eucharistic Office was matter of *history* when we made it our own, and the present age is giving it further importance for historians yet to come. This, always before the middle of the sixteenth century held to be the vital ingredient in a Liturgy, was in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., (1549,) and so was the word "altar" in several places, "the Lord's board" being in the form of either an altar or a table; the latter equivalent to the former in this sacrament, as is proved by the custom of the early ages of the Church: and with those ages that of the brief period of this Prayer-book is continuous, not only through the line of Rome, but those also of the Greek and other Eastern Churches. In the second Prayer-book of Edward, however, (1552) this Liturgy proper and the word "altar" were cancelled, through the prevailing influence of Calvin, both as an extensively popular name and particularly as represented by Bucer and Martyr, then in England, and somewhat pusillanimously consulted by the English reformers: and he who runs may read that this change was intended, principally indeed, to annul transubstantiation, yet also but too plainly to discountenance the sacrificial and sacerdotal theory, viz., that the priest offers at the altar the consecrated bread and wine as a sacrifice additional to that of the lips; that of the heart being in both. This theory however was preserved, and still regarded as that of the English Church, upon individual authority of the highest character, yet by the usual resort of *construction;* which, under that authority, is the principal ground on which some of the Oxford Tracts themselves maintain their congruity with the English standards; and one of them (I think) intimates even that the elements not consumed are "offered" in the Post-communion. This oblatory or sacrificial act in the eucharist, expunged in the second book of Edward, re-appeared in the Scottish Liturgy; and the attempt to introduce that form into England was alleged against Archbishop Laud, and was one of the causes of his tremendous unpopularity, which overawed the king and lords, and brought him to the block; the doctrine of a sacrifice, however exaggerated by his enemies, being the *gravamen* of that imputation. No difference of opinion existed as to the meaning in the Scottish book of this act of worship. This large amount of indubitable history, so indubitable that it need not be more particularly stated, establishes the purport of the Oblation in Edward's first and the Scottish Liturgies. And with these facts on record, the General Convention of 1789 (without opposition "to any considerable extent," says Bishop White) restored that highest act of worship; from the Scottish Liturgy directly, through Bishop Seabury; from the first Prayer-book of Edward, as the next link; and from high Christian antiquity, nay, the highest by sober and honest inference, as the upper link connecting the act and its doctrine with the apostles and the New Testament. Was this a 'rejection of the system' by our Church? or is there the shadow of a reason for intimating that Bishop Seabury and the measure he had at heart (for he 'hardly considered the English form as strictly amounting to a consecration') were treated slightingly? On the contrary, was not the "system," without any "considerable" opposition, Bishop White being judge, *established* in our borders? And, among *us,* was not, and is not, the opposite "system" indebted to *construction,* together with an appeal to the English Prayer-book though here differing from ours, for its respectability? Be the thing right, or be it wrong, the loud and unextinguishable voice of HISTORY determines that the sacrificial and sacerdotal theology is integrated with the authenticated faith of our ecclesiastical body. And, in such a matter, the voice of history, not construction or private opinion, however respectable, must govern.

Thus was laid one of the first "foundations of our ecclesiastical system," of our theological creed and profession, *the* foundation distinctively our own; for every thing else we then adopted is contained in the English standards. It belonged to us and to the Scottish Church; and humble as we then were, the latter was so much more depressed, that we probably gave the doctrine more note than they. With the doctrine thus ours, by succession from Scotland, we preserve also the Scottish Episcopal succession. Seabury united in the consecration of Claggett; Claggett in that of Jarvis; Jarvis in that of Hobart and Griswold; Hobart in all during his life, (Meade being the last,) except that of Ravenscroft, in which Griswold united, as also in several others both before and since the death of Hobart, presiding in some of the later ones; so that every one of our bishops is of the Scottish as well as English lineage. And we may trust that their succession in orders is a pledge of their maintaining inviolate the succession in doctrine.

The last laid of our "foundations" is the Institution Office; and there we find the sacerdotal theory, with the sacrificial, broadly displayed. If the reader will turn to it, he will find the expressions, "sacerdotal function," "sacerdotal relation," "sacerdotal connection," in the Letter of Institution, which is "read" as part of the solemnity. He will find the expressions "rails of the Altar," and "kneel at the Altar," in three of the rubrics, and "the right and left of the Altar, without the rails," in one of them; also the phrase "serve at thy Holy Altar" in the prayer offered by the instituted minister 'kneeling at the Altar:' five times is the word thus used. Here is the very language, the absence of which in the English Prayer-book, and in the other portions of our own, is made of so much account by those who are inimical to this theory: the "table" is called the "altar," and the "priest" is called *sacerdos* or a priest proper. Of itself, it establishes that theory; and, in connexion with the oblatory act in the eucharist, it ought, one would think, to place beyond question that it is a doctrine of our branch of the body of Christ. The Institution Office, it has long been understood, and lately ascertained, was furnished us by Dr. William Smith, originally of the Scottish Episcopal Church, (not the older clergyman of the same name and title,) and had the approbation of Bishop Seabury; being thus our second great obligation to the principles of that venerable man, and of that indomitable Catholic community. Our Convention accepted and adopted it without difficulty: "no objection had been made to the offence," says Bishop White. (P. 195.) It is part and parcel of our Prayer-book, as much so as any other portion of it: for, whether the Table of Contents include only what was ratified in 1789, or extend to the Articles and Offices adopted since, all the constitutional contents are in the book whether in the table or not, and have precisely the same *authority;* all are equally protected by the 8th article of the Constitution, and none of them have any other legal protection: without the action of two General Conventions, with the intervening process, the Institution Office cannot be touched; and with that, the Morning or Evening Prayer, or the Litany, or the Communion or Baptismal services, &c., or any portions of them, may equally be cancelled or altered. No power can dig up this latest of our "foundations," but such as may cast out the whole of them from our ecclesiastical fabric.

An anecdote concerning the meaning of these expressions in the Institution Office may not be unacceptable to the reader, perhaps not unworthy of record. On September 23, 1835, the Rev. J. A. Clark was instituted the rector of St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia, by Bishop White. When the services were over, as the Bishop was leaving the chancel, he gently yet with much animation exclaimed to one near him to this effect:—"I had not observed it—that word 'sacerdotal,' and that word 'altar'—had I noticed them, I should certainly have objected." Yet Bishop White had previously instituted at least one clergyman; and was in the House of Bishops in both 1804 and 1808, when the (Induction and) Institution Office was placed in our Prayer-book; and in the House of Deputies in 1808, were the Rev. R. C. Moore, (afterwards Bishop of Virginia,) L. Bull, G. Dashiel, and S. Wilmer; still, no objection was made to the Office. But whatever Bishop White's previous inadvertance, he now saw the meaning of these words, and acknowledged it.—For the above anecdote, you have the name of a witness now living.

It will be observed, that no definition has here been offered of the *nature* of the sacrifice made in the oblatory part of the eucharist, ex- [illegible] and the heart, which means of course that it is the 'offering to God' of the bread and wine after they have been consecrated. By the act of consecration, say the vast majority of divines and all Churches, the bread and wine are made the body and blood of Christ, in whatever sense: and the Romanists define this change to be—by transubstantiation. The latter notion is wholly precluded by our Articles. But either of the other opinions may be held by those who symbolise with the view maintained in these remarks: thus—there is a sacrifice proper, by a priest proper, of the consecrated bread and wine,—either, as mere elements, which are just as good for sacrifice as the 'devoted' blood of bulls and of goats,—or, as the sacramental emblems of Christ's body and blood,—or, as being that body and blood, in virtue of the holy names by which Christ Himself calls them—or, as His body and blood, by reason of the mysterious real (but not substantial) presence which He vouchsafes to them. Between these several opinions, it does not belong to the present paper to intimate a choice: its argument covers ground common to all of them.—Only let not the expressions "proper priest" and "proper sacrifice" be misunderstood. They mean simply *as* "proper" as were the Mosaic or patriarchal priests and sacrifices. Christ's were the only *effectual* priesthood and the only *effectual* sacrifice before the throne of grace; those of the old rite were but *prefigurative* or *typical* of that; and those of the Christian rite are but *commemorative* of it: each of the three being "proper" to their respective function.

It must further be remarked, concerning the word "priesthood," in the 9th Article reported to the General Convention of 1799, (the reader will find it in the Journals printed by Bioren, p. 171,) that the postponement of that report, ending in its never coming up again, has no bearing on our "system," which was then sufficiently defined in "The Oblation," and in a few years was still more so in the Office of Institution. Moreover, the objection, that the term "priesthood" in that Article "denoted all the orders of the Christian ministry, and was not confined to the order of presbyters, as in the established Ordinal, of the former of which there is no example in the institutions of the Church of England," is fully answered in the title to the 32d of the XXXIX Articles, belonging both to England and to us—"Of the marriage of *Priests*—under which common designation are immediately included in the Article itself "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." The body thus denominated in the aggregate "Priests," are of course a "priesthood." The Latin title is, if possible, more decisive, *De conjugio Sacerdotum;* (Burnet, Oxford, 1814,) thus placing the very word most of all controverted, *Sacerdos,* in that outermost wall (the Articles) between us and our adversaries, particularly the Romanists. When combatting the error concerning celibacy, which Rome has carried out more fully than any others, our Church and the Church of England declare plainly, to her and to all the world, that our ministers are freely allowed to marry, yet that they are "Priests," *sacerdotes,* an appellation containing the whole sacerdotal and sacrificial doctrine of the Gospel-Church.

And now, what have we, American Churchmen, who have our own "foundations," and laid them ourselves, to do with the recent decision in England (if a decision it prove to be) concerning the legality of "altars" in the houses of God, or of tables in the altar form? Of this question we are entirely independent. Our "system" names both the "table" and the "altar," and regards them as effectively the same thing: and the *prothesis,* or side table, or credence table, is perfectly unimportant. The difficulties in the Church of England have no place in ours. The same Sir Herbert who gives one decision in the premises in the English case, would be compelled to give a directly

* "The Catholic Church properly has no existence."—*Noah Webster's Dictionary.*

† It was a separate service until the temper of the Puritanical times, leading men to despise the morning prayer without preaching, Archbishop Grindal, by an injunction, ordered that the two services should be joined, which has been so ever since. It is easy to see that they could as easily be disjoined, if the Church should come to put its true value upon the Eucharistic services.

* These are different from the Articles previously submitted in the "Proposed Book."

contrary one with *our* standards and their history before him. As matters appear to stand there, the title to the 32d Article establishes the sacerdotal theory, while Sir Herbert's Court condemns that of sacrifice! a rather equivocal position for a Church. May ours never fall into so pitiable a dilemma!

Your OLD FRIEND.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—The canons of our Church are in a state of some peculiarity. Our own canons are the only canons that are obligatory upon us, *as such*. A canon of another Church may enjoin or prohibit what the law of God enjoins or prohibits, and as this prohibition extends to all Churches, the canon may in popular language be held to bind all Churches. But the distinction is easily apprehended between this sort of authority and what is called canonical authority. In like manner canons of other Churches may declare and enforce doctrines founded upon the word of God, and therefore to be received in all Churches; but while such doctrines may be regarded as authoritative, the authority is of God and not of the Council or Church that declares them, further than as we may acknowledge the doctrine of the Church as evidence of the law of God. But in reference to discipline, the canons of no Church are respected to any extent beyond the body which enacted them.

While our Church has on this principle made canons of discipline for herself, she has given us definitions of the various punishments which she authorizes, and yet some of them derive their character from the definition given of them by other Churches, or in Treatises upon the Canon Law. For instance, our first canon of 1789 on the subject of "sober conversation required in ministers," says that the offenders shall be subject to the *ecclesiastical censure* of admonition or suspension or degradation. The canon does not say what this censure is in any particular. A definition of it is not given in any canon of that or of any subsequent session. The meaning of these different censures is nevertheless to be sought and found before the canon can be executed. They are not words whose popular signification can be adopted, because if they have such a meaning, it is not sufficiently definite to be relied upon in the administration of penal law, and the canon, moreover, has declared that this is not the meaning of the Convention, for it says the *ecclesiastical* censure is intended. The ministers and bishops and tribunals of the Church are consequently compelled to seek the nature of this censure elsewhere; and doubtless they are to seek it in the ecclesiastical or canon law of other countries. That law is to be resorted to, not as having authority in this Church, but as explaining the meaning of certain censures borrowed or adopted from that law by the authority of this Church.

Now here is the peculiarity of our condition. The Convention has not said from what code or body of canons in particular the nature and limitation of these censures are to be obtained. We are not referred to any particular legal dictionary for their description. It is left open to be contended by any one that the whole mass of canons made in time past by any Church, inflicting any of these censures may be resorted to, and that our tribunals may call and select any form of that censure which they may find any where in this mass, if they prefer it. I do not say that it can be so contended with reason, but it may be with some show of reason. However rare or peculiar the form may be, if it is an ecclesiastical censure of these denominations that has been used at all, it may be thought open to adoption and application. In one respect the Convention has by a subsequent canon limited this choice, or rather has restricted the meaning of one of the censures; for when degradation from the ministry is inflicted, the degradation is declared to be entire, and not from a higher to a lower order, as was the practice in one or more of the ancient Churches. But in regard to suspension, this has not been in any way limited, and we may be at liberty to take its meaning or form wherever we find it adopted in the Church. There is vast inconvenience in this, and the evidence of it may be seen in the sentence of suspension pronounced upon the late Bishop of Pennsylvania, which is not only suspension from his office of bishop (all indeed from which the canon authorized the House of Bishops to suspend him) but also from the *public* exercise of his ministry, leaving him the full *private* exercise of it in every respect. The English Canon Law it is believed knows nothing of such a suspension. *Bingham* says that he has heard of but one instance of it, mentioned by St. Basil, and he obviously thinks that it is not entitled to respect. 2 *Bing.* page 189, sec. 10. It is a suspension of most dangerous import, exciting *prima facie* the general suspicion that it is either too severe or too light a sentence, and that those who inflict it have not regarded the nature of the offence so much as some public or popular impressions in regard to it. The uncertainty in which the law is left by such loose and imperfect language in the canons, is of the highest prejudice to the administration of ecclesiastical justice.

So as to the limitations of suspension in point of time—we are left exposed to like difficulty from this general use of the terms in the canon of 1844; and bishops and laymen who know not half as much of the Canon Law as the youngest Proctor at Doctors' Commons, are driving their studies to see whether the sentence inflicted upon the Bishop of New York is good or void—while the bishop and the diocese are suffering and must continue to suffer under it, though absolutely void, as much and indeed more than they would from a sentence which all should admit to be valid.

If we mean to preserve peace in our Church this state of things must come to an end, and men of all parties must unite their efforts to give certainty to our penal canons, if they mean to keep together the Body that is now governed by them.

One thing, however, may be regarded as free from doubt in this matter, namely, that the reference to the foreign Ecclesiastical or Canon Law for the definition of admonition, suspension or degradation, does not invoke that law as in any point more binding *as such* upon our Church, than if we did not refer to it at all. We refer to it not for the law so much as for the fact, namely, what the law is, as we have agreed by the reference to follow that in the particular instance, in the same manner as if we had written out the definition and limitation of those censures in the canon that authorizes the infliction of them. From the time the canon is passed, these censures may be inflicted under its authority, as then for the first time applied to the offences it describes. In all other respects the Foreign Canon Law is without any influence whatever upon those offences; and as a foreign law it is not acknowledged by any such reference to have had any antecedent authority, or even to have any present authority. The whole authority is in the canon of our Church from the time that it speaks the will of the Church.

Let this be briefly applied to the sentence of suspension pronounced upon the Bishop of New York under the canon of 1844, for acts alleged to have been committed years before that canon was passed.

Until the canon of 1841 there was no canon of the Church for the presentment of a bishop for any offence whatever, nor until the canon of 1844 any that provided a mode of trial, or authorized the infliction of a punishment. I say with great confidence, that until this last canon bishops were not subject to the ecclesiastical censure of admonition, suspension or degradation. If they were, who was to pronounce the sentence, and what was the sentence to be? Was a minister of the Church to censure his superior? Was a bishop of one diocese to censure another, or were the bishops of two or more dioceses to acquire this authority over an equal, or the House of Bishops, a legislative body, to convert itself into a judicial body? And from what code were they to derive the pain or censure inflicted, since our own inflicted none? The Scriptures annex no such punishment to the offences of bishops, certainly not the punishments of suspension and degradation—they are not among the sanctions of the moral law—the laws of foreign churches do not bind, and we had none in our own Church. The suggestion of such a power before any enactment by the Church is preposterous. The Church, until she acted in 1841, did not mean to act, and it is clear that she did not suffer by not acting. The natural sanctions of the moral law were sufficient to enforce its observance—the dread of God's displeasure—of the stings of conscience—of the world's contempt. The Church at least thought them sufficient, for she did not act; and she acted only when she finally thought otherwise. Whether she thought wisely when she acted—whether there is more security in a penal code which prepares tribunals and punishments for bishops, than in one which makes no provision because it regards their moral delinquency as impossible, is the old question whether the code which omitted all reference to the crime of parricide, did not contribute to make it impossible by assuming it to be so. The Church may have been wise or foolish in the omission—she may have done all she ought to have done, or she may have done less: the omission may have been a theoretical defect, though no one for the first fifty years of the Church—her golden age of unity, peace, and godly concord—can possibly regard it as a practical evil: any view, in fine, may be taken of the policy of the Church in this respect which any one may choose to take; but under all views of this question, one position remains equally true in ethics as in politics, that when she first ordained the punishment of suspension for the offence of a bishop, she ordained it for offences that should afterwards come, and not for previous acts. The Church herself is under a moral restraint. She cannot pass the bounds which circumscribe all moral legislation. "The laws only can determine the punishment of crimes." This is one of the axioms of Beccaria's great work. If a new punishment can be applied to an old offence, it is not the law that punishes but the despotic legislator, or the partial judge. One of the first and fundamental principles in the interpretation of penal law, is that it must be intended to operate prospectively upon both the crime and the punishment. If it declares the contrary in express terms, it is in itself a violation of the first principles of moral legislation and is void. Every such law wants the essential virtue of promulgation, which God himself has required for his own laws. "Come up to me in the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone and a law, and commandments which I have written, THAT THOU MAYST TEACH THEM."

Some writers have supposed that a new punishment may be lawfully inflicted for a former offence, if it be milder than the punishment that was annexed to the offence when it was committed; but in addition to the answer, that this qualification of the principle does in no degree apply to a moral offence to which the law of the Church annexed no punishment, the qualification itself is rejected by the best authorities as a dangerous tampering with this most indispensable principle.

Upon the whole I leave these remarks in full confidence that they prove the illegal application of the canon of 1844 to the case of the Bishop of New York. I do not impute to any one of the Judges the lowest degree of intentional wrong in such an application of the canon. The distinction was no doubt overlooked, possibly from too much eagerness in some to punish, and in others to place the defence, where for one I think it was validly placed, upon the *facts*. But in the present aspect of the case the force of the distinction, as fatally destroying the validity of the sentence, and making it a void sentence before the whole Church is worthy, it strikes me, of the gravest consideration.

From all the evil of the case, good however may come to the Church, greater even than the evil that it now suffers. Our code is defective. Our canons have been carelessly drawn. Our tribunals have been defectively constituted. Our forms of proceeding are loose, and our rules of evidence obscure. Certainty is the mother of repose. Doubt is the foster mother of dispute and strife. Our danger has become manifest and imminent in the very first instance in which an attempt is made to administer such a code, by the agents and means that are provided; and it shows itself not so much in inquiries for truth, as in irritation and inflammation which threaten the concord of the Church. If "out of this nettle danger we pluck the flower safety," the safety of more definite canons—more impartial tribunals—more clear rules of evidence and procedure—and above and far above all in importance, the right of appeal,—we may finally be thankful for the infliction, even of an illegal sentence, as having been mercifully permitted to irritate the Church into a more vigilant inspection and protection of all her necessary defences.

NEO-CESAREA.

To the Editor of the Churchman.

Dear Sir,—Not long after the Young Men's Church Missionary Society of New York commenced the Seaman's Mission, which has so happily succeeded in this port, as our friends are aware, the Floating Church of our Saviour for Seamen having from its first services been attended by over two thousand different sons of the ocean, and a large and crowded congregation being usually seen there on a Sunday, the holy rite of confirmation was administered to some seamen. Among the number upon whom the hands of the bishop were laid on this solemn and affecting occasion—the confirmation of sailors—was an officer in the United States service. To show that our Church institutions do not cast their bread upon the waters in vain, I now send you an extract from a letter written by this interesting officer, a lieutenant, handed me this afternoon, that I think will not fail to touch a chord in the hearts of Episcopalians, and encourage them to erect in other ports chapels on shore or afloat for the sons of the ocean.

I am dear sir, very respectfully, yours,

B. C. C. PARKER,
Minister of the Floating Church of our Saviour for Seamen.

New York, April 16, 1845.

The letter is directed to the President of the American Seamen's Friend Society, and is dated Feb. 23, 1845, on board the U. S. Ship Portsmouth, lat. 19 40 south, long. 38 west, at sea, in which he says:—

"With the liberal donation of Prayer Books from the Bible and Common Prayer Book Society I have supplied them (the men) most fully in their messes; also in the sick bay, adding several of those most excellent books, the Sailor's Manual of Devotion, (by Rev. Dr. Berrian,) which little work is of great value to all who feel the need of prayer and constant devotion; even to those unawakened to their condition it carries a conviction of the most certain character by its simplicity and truth. I hope the Rev. Mr. Parker of the Floating Church of our Saviour, in New York, will be able to prosecute this noble enterprise of most disinterested benevolence.* Our excellent and sincerely Christian Captain sets in himself a most excellent example of what a Christian officer should be—amiable to a degree I have never seen in any other. Service is held regularly on Sunday, when the weather will permit, our Captain officiating himself in a solemn and impressive manner, using the Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

"To-day being Sunday, our men are all dressed in white frocks and trowsers, all the officers dressed with great care and neatness; we had the first general muster in summer clothing, thermometer 84 degrees. I have never seen a more agreeable "tout ensemble" than our deck presented during this solemn and yet agreeable worship.

"Please present my regards to Rev. Mr. Parker, and tell him I am greatly obliged to him for the donation of the Sailor's Manual of Devotion—also for those he intended I should take when I visited New York, but which I had not time to call for.

"I write this letter on deck in a *mid-watch*, that it may go as it is, by day light, by the St. Joseph, for New York.

"We have the happiest ship of war I have ever heard of. An oath or an angry word in any quarter is scarcely heard. All the officers from the Captain to the youngest midshipman, are like warm friends on the most intimate terms so far as a due regard to station and discipline will admit. I look forward to a most delightful cruise. Such may it be; and that we may all be preserved and return to our homes and friends, is the daily prayer of your obedient friend.

"We ran 4085 miles to the equator in 22 days, 5725 miles in 33 days, several of them calm, or nearly so."

If, Mr. Editor, here are not indications of a delightful change going on in the religious condition of seamen at the present day, it will be difficult to say what can be so denominated. O that Episcopalians throughout our land would now wake up to a sense of their duty! When God is working may they not remain inactive. How many millions have sailors earned for them, and alas how few dollars have they as yet ever expended for their spiritual benefit!

B. C. C. P.

* The gratuitous distribution of this little book by funds sent to him for that purpose by the friends of seamen, to every seaman in the United States, through the agency of our clergy in other ports, those in New York being supplied at the Floating Church.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—Having read what has appeared in your paper from various able correspondents on the subject of the sentence of the late Ecclesiastical Court, as well as your own Editorial remarks, without being satisfied of the illegality and consequent nullity of that act, I feel tempted to present briefly some views which I offer for your insertion in the Churchman, although conscious of their not being altogether in accordance with such as have been expressed by yourself. The legal construction of the sentence is a point of so vast importance, and bearing so directly upon the peace and welfare of the Church, that it may well permit an extended discussion, and require the presentation of variant views as conducive to a more careful consideration of the whole ground.

What authority did the canon confer upon the Court, in the matter of the sentence? It authorized the Court to pronounce a sentence, either of admonition, suspension or deposition—and that was all. It gave them no *express* power to attach conditions or limitations of any kind to the sentence; and it did not define what was meant by either of those three terms. The Court determined to pronounce the sentence of suspension, and did pronounce it—*just in the words of the canon*—without condition or limitation of any sort, and without attempting to define its meaning. The sentence reads, that the Rt. Rev. B. T. Onderdonk "is suspended from all exercise of his Episcopal and ministerial functions"—it does not say "indefinitely" or "for a specified time," or how otherwise, but merely that he "is suspended." Now, how can this be void, or a nullity, following as it does the very language of the canon, neither adding to, nor taking aught from it? It is said that the Court intended an indefinite suspension. How do we know that? We can know nothing of the intention of the Court, but from its official language—the sentence must speak for itself. But "it affixes no limit to its duration, and must therefore operate indefinitely, or have been intended so to operate." This does not at all follow, and the assertion is a begging of the very question to be decided. That question is, "what is the legal effect of the sentence," or, "has it no legal effect, being a nullity?" If the sentence means an *indefinite* suspension, the canon must mean the same thing—and that settles the point; for it would be hard to show that the canon was illegal.

The fair and well settled rule of construction is, so to construe every questionable act or document, that it may stand, if possible—*ut res magis valeat quam pereat*. The Court is in law presumed to have intended to do something; if their sentence be a nullity, their intention has been disappointed. Whereas if it can stand, in subordination to the rules of law, it should be allowed to stand, provided, that when so construed, it still remains a sentence of *suspension*. It must not be converted into something else. So that the true question is upon the construction of the sentence *as it stands*—what effect has it? It seems to me clear, that an irrevocable sentence of indefinite suspension cannot be supported; its qualities of irrevocability and indefiniteness being repugnant to the idea of suspension, the very term implying a limitation of time expressed in the sentence, or dependant upon the performance of conditions, or implying the possibility of removal at the discretion of a superior. The sentence, therefore, pronounced upon the two Bishops Onderdonk, (for the remark is applicable to both cases,) cannot be of an indefinite, irrevocable character—it must be of a limited nature. There is no condition attached to either sentence—of course, neither can be removed by the performance of any condition. How then may they be revoked, or more properly speaking, be taken off from those Rt. Rev. Fathers? Is there any superior power in the Church which can remove the suspension? If it became necessary to decide this question on the assumption of the continuance of the sentence in force until some express declaration by the Church of its revocation, I should answer that I think there is, and that the General Convention is that power. The Court itself, of course, cannot exercise any control over the sentence. That tribunal has performed its office and is defunct. The wisdom of our Ecclesiastical Legislature saw fit to constitute it a Court of final jurisdiction—its decision was to be rendered without appeal—but the General Convention intrusted it simply with the power of pronouncing a certain sentence, which, in the case in hand, was, as I have said, necessarily of a limited character—what is its limit then in point of duration?

Two answers may be given to this question. First, that the sentence will continue in force until the Convention see fit expressly to remove it—or, secondly, that the sentence expires necessarily with the meeting of that body. Although the point is a nice and difficult one, it seems to me, considering the phraseology of the canon, that the last is the proper solution of the difficulty—and that it is more in accordance with legal principles and the spirit of penal laws and the liberty of individuals, to attach such a necessary limit to the sentence, than to make its removal dependant upon the will of a majority of the two houses constituting our General Convention. It would have presented another question, if the Court had seen fit to suspend the bishop for a term longer than the period of the next Convention's meeting—or had attached conditions to his suspension. But this case does not contain that feature; "sufficient, therefore, unto the day, is the evil thereof," and sufficient, perhaps, has been said for one communication.

W.

For the Churchman.

"Let us all to Meditation."

These words, Mr. Editor, of the great English dramatist came involuntarily into my mind a short time since, as I was pondering on serious matters which, in the course of Divine Providence, are *now* and *here* especially pressed upon our notice. There is indeed no immediate connection between the occasion on which Shakspeare introduced these words, and the matters to which I now refer. *These*, however, as was *that*, are full fraught with calls and warnings and most moving incitements, to *deep, serious, soul-absorbing meditation*.

I have told but the honest truth in saying that these words of Shakspeare first came into my mind. Soon, however, they were superseded by others from the blessed Book with which, I thank God, I am much more familiar.

"BE STILL AND KNOW THAT I AM GOD" were *its* words of point and power which entered into my heart.

Such turn was given to my thoughts by the simultaneous pressure upon my mind of heads of deep and solemn meditation of diverse character. I had just heard of the death of our venerable friend Dr. Milnor, hurried from this world with but few minutes warning. It soon occurred to me that he was the third Presbyter of this Diocese who had died within less than four months; and all of them *suddenly*. That true-hearted Christian, Mr. Editor, your venerable and beloved father, died, as you know, almost instantaneously. And good Mr. Clarkson, although much enfeebled in constitution had, I am told, a call quite unexpected at the time, to lay down his short but faithful ministry.

The thoughts thus engendered came upon me while I was pondering upon the dreadful catastrophe of the steamboat "Swallow," consigning so many almost in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, to a watery grave; and with its deeply painful interest increased by the uncertainty still hanging over the melancholy event, to whom or what number it had proved fatal—almost every fresh intelligence telling of some who, from the lot of those agonized by *fears*, have passed to that of those whose fears have changed to the hardly more agonizing *certainty* of the loss of loved ones; and of some who first knew that loved ones were *exposed*, by hearing that they are *gone*.

These various things weighed heavily on my mind, mingling with the deeply absorbing emotions which have so long filled it, growing out of the state of our stricken, smitten diocese—palsied, as it were, in the midst of high health, buoyant hope, and large enjoyment of Heaven's temporal and spiritual blessings, her head cut short in his career of devoted official labor, deprived of his support, and now, for months, almost like a manacled solitary prisoner; and with a stop put to much of the agency by which he was so efficiently doing her part in the great work of advancing the cause of Christ and his Church.

It would be useless to endeavor to analyze the process by which these several circumstances became mingled in my mind into *one solemn call* to meditation, and to the reverent, subdued, submissive, trustful, and prayerful recognition of the hand of God therein, indicated by the divine call, "BE STILL."

In my ponderings on the judgments of Heaven thus visiting the Mount Zion and the world around it, my mind involuntarily fell into a train of thought, suggested by the Gospel principle, that when a man is born into the Church, he is not only invested with a new character and new responsibilities, but all of moral character and responsibility which he has by nature becomes merged therein. Thus led on I became absorbed in meditating on our duty, under such providential visitations, as a *Church*, and as *individual members* of the Church.

"BE STILL!" This divine admonition is not very welcome to the natural heart. *It* had rather be doing, be complaining, be striving, be casting about for remedial plans and operations, and be *active* rather than *passive*, and *look around*, rather than *look within*, for the sinful causes of God's judgments.

True faith dictates another course. Let all good Christians resolve to follow it. Let them remember the word of Jehovah, "Not by might nor by power, but by *my Spirit*," whereby he shows the nothingness of human force—physical, intellectual, or moral—whatever devices it may forecast, whatever plans it may form, by whatever motives it may be actuated, without *His Spirit*. Man's restless tendency to be noisy, and planning and doing, often seriously interferes, even among the conscientious, with a true recognition of the providence and grace of God. I am far from being opposed—it were unchristian to be so—to prudent and judicious exercise, in faith, humility and charity, of the moral agency whereby our Heavenly Father has given us the means of being largely instrumental to our own weal or wo, to the averting of evil, and to deliverance out of it. But there are principles in the natural heart perpetually urging even the best of men to carry this too far, until it ministers to pride, presumption, worldly-mindedness, and the casting off of faith; and thus brings on judicial abandonment to the folly of man's might and power and the withdrawing of God's Spirit.

There is too much of this in the Church. I would affectionately and earnestly entreat my brethren to pause. Let us for a while *be still*, and throw ourselves in true faith on the Spirit of our God. In quietness let us meditate much more than we do, pray much more, and fast much more. Let each search deeply into *his own heart* for reasons why God should visit us in anger. Let us be more frequent and devout in God's temple and at his altar. Let his word be more thoroughly our counsellor. Let us give increased devotion to all the duties we owe in care for our own souls, and in love and charity to our fellow men. Thus let us see if the Lord will not, for Christ's sake, return and repent; be gracious unto us; and by the enlightening and sanctifying influences of his Spirit, enable us duly to profit by all his judgments, open the way for deliverance out of our troubles and difficulties, and cause us to walk therein.

You see, Mr. Editor, that I have not studied method. I have penned my thoughts as they came into an anxious and, I hope, humbled mind; and now venture affectionately to offer them for such sympathy as they may find among my fellow Churchmen.

FRATER.

For the Churchman.

Tracts for the Seasons.

NO. XIV.

The Fifth Sunday after Easter is called also Rogation Sunday. This name is given to it by the Church on account of its immediately preceding the *Rogation-Fast*. This comprises the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday between that Sunday and Holy Thursday, the Great Festival of the Ascension of our Lord.

The three days of the Rogation Fast are termed "*Rogation-Days*," from the Latin *Rogationes*, the name given to the services performed thereon in the early Church. Their special observance has been of about fourteen hundred years continuance. At its commencement, however, it was not a novelty; but rather a more formal development, and permanent establishment of a primitive godly usage which appears to have been before rather occasional than stated, and perhaps not very general. The hallowing of these days was among those things in the Church of Rome which the learned and scriptural reformers of the Church of England justly appreciated as Catholic rather than papal, and therefore retained. They did not, however, appoint any public service for them, except that one of the Homilies, divided into four parts, is appropriate to them.

The observances whence originated the Rogation-Days, and their first appointment itself, appear to have had reference to special circumstances. Soon, however, they assumed the more general character of an occasion for uniting Christians in solemn spring-time prayer for the fruitfulness of the earth, and for God's mercy in sparing us from the just judgments to which our sins expose us, and which the withholding of that fruitfulness would bring upon us in such appalling measure.

Our branch of the Catholic Church takes these days as she receives them from the English, making no provision for their special *public* observance; but requiring thereon "extraordinary acts and exercises of devotion," and "such a measure of abstinence as is more especially suited" to those acts and exercises. We should gratefully, reverently, and obediently accept them at the hands of our spiritual mother, as among the evidences of her affection, and among the means whereby she would cherish, in the seclusion of private devotion, the spiritual health and strength which tend, by God's mercy in Jesus Christ, to growth in grace in this world, and in the world to come everlasting life.

The subject of PRAYER is therefore especially appropriate to this Rogation Season. It is one of those many points, graciously included in God's revelation, whose simplicity, clearness, and straight-forwardness of principle and duty are a standing reproof of man's vain glorious and rebellious disposition to be wise above what is written. This is one of the most fruitful sources of the unhappy diversity of religious opinions which exists among Christians. Aiming at such unhallowed wisdom, proud of originality in theory, and ingenuity in explanation, and delighted with the acquisition of some new insight into imagined religious difficulties, men are striving for the mastery on points on which all must be in the dark until it please God to impart a higher degree of knowledge than was ever attained in this probationary state. Leaving the plain path of duty, which is sufficient for all their study and their care, they are bewildering themselves with theories, making vain efforts at nice explanations, and sharply contending about the divine attributes, the secret dealings of God's providence and grace, and the scope and operation of His decrees and counsels. Pride, idle curiosity, and love of strife, seeking gratification in the mazes of fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute, fools rush in where angels dare not tread.

Amid the intricacies and perplexities in which men have thus involved the sincere word of God, how gratifying to the devout and humble Christian to dwell on those precepts of his holy faith which, with the dignity and authority of divine inspiration, cast down at once all these high imaginations, and in the simplicity that is in Christ, press religion home to the heart, and urge it upon the life.

Such is the character of our Lord's instructions generally. It is especially so of one of His most gracious commands touching the duty of prayer. While men are distracting themselves with theories and discussions on the consistency of divine prescience, control, or decrees, with human free agency, and with the suspending of divine mercy on the contingency of man's seeking it in prayer, the wisdom which is from above, frowning on such speculations, and silencing the doubts and difficulties which they engender, speaketh on this wise:—"ASK, AND IT SHALL BE GIVEN YOU. SEEK, AND YE SHALL FIND. KNOCK, AND IT SHALL BE OPENED UNTO YOU." Trouble not yourselves to explain how this can be. Seek not to know *how* the dispensations of the omniscient and Almighty Disposer of events can be dependent on the will and conduct of man. Give not a moment's attention to reconciling the counsels and decrees of God with your own moral agency and accountability. Leave such subjects to Him who has reserved them as secret things belonging to Himself. Humbly submitting to any trial of your faith that may thus be made a part of the probation through which you are to pass to seeing, not as now through a glass darkly, but face to face, and knowing, not as now in part, but even as also you are known, come at once, come confidingly, come in full assurance of faith, nothing doubting that God will keep and perform His word, and obey the gracious mandate, "Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened unto you."

The unqualified manner in which these comfortable words of our Saviour Christ are addressed to all His followers furnishes also a satisfactory answer to other difficulties into which men have brought themselves by undue speculation in religious matters. It is essential to some human systems termed evangelical, that there be denied the power of any man to engage in the acceptable performance of any religious duty until the operation of the grace of God points him out as one of those specially destined to be justified, sanctified, and saved. This arises from dwelling much on the undoubted truths of the corruption, inability, and destitution of merit inherent in our fallen nature, without giving also its due value, for its sufficiency, universality, and efficacy, to the mercy of God in our redemption through Jesus Christ.

It is true, as asserted in one of our articles of religion, that "the condition of man after the fall of Adam, is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and *calling upon God*. Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ, preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will." But the accordance of our "Articles," and of our doctrinal standards generally, with Holy Scripture, is also seen in their clear recognition and enforcement of the great truth that the redemption wrought by Jesus Christ was for *all mankind*. Consequently, "the grace of God by Christ" is the purchased privilege of all. All have that "*preventing grace*" which is essential to *commencing*, and all, by the proper use of that, may have the *co-operating* grace essential to *prosecuting*, a Christian course. But the harmony of God's acts and dispensations requires that all this be compatible with the free agency which He has made essential to our nature. There is thus restored to that nature the ability to will and do what is right, which was lost by the fall. No man is *compelled* savingly to exercise this ability; and none *prevented*. Otherwise hardened insensibility to spiritual things would not be a man's *fault*, but his *misfortune*, and could therefore involve no guilt.

The grace of God in Christ, enabling every one to come to Him that he may be sanctified and saved, leaves all without excuse who will not come. The call to ask and seek and knock, is given alike to all. All then have ability given them to obey it. The idea that some special and peculiar operation of divine grace is necessary to entrance on religious duty is a fiction which every one's consciousness will contradict. Who feels that he is under any moral or physical inability to turn unto the Lord? Who can in his conscience say that himself is not wholly to blame for neglecting to seek his God? That neglect is a resisting of the Spirit. The grace of God in Christ is so freely offered to every man as fearfully to increase the guilt of delay in religious duty. Let none wait in expectation of some miraculous working of the Spirit to compel his prostration at the throne of grace. The danger is very imminent that he will wait until he is forever removed beyond the reach of that throne. Now is the accepted time. Now the Spirit waits to direct and aid him. Now, as God's word exhorts, entreats, and warns him, let him consent, let him draw near to God, let him ask and seek and knock.

It is his Heavenly Father who calls him. He is infinitely wise to know what is for our greatest benefit, and infinitely good to will, and infinitely powerful to effect it; and prayer is His own appointed means for our obtaining it.

The contemplation of His infinite *wisdom*, while cherished in humbling contrast with the feebleness, insufficiency, and waywardness of our own judgments, should fill us with that entire resignation which flows from thorough trust and confidence in Him. He knows, better than we possibly can, what is most for our good.

For the *spiritual* blessings of the directing, aiding, consoling, and sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost, and of the heavenly rewards purchased by Christ's atonement, we may draw near and ask in full assurance that they will not be denied, provided we do so in the true humility, faith, and devotion of the Gospel; for the promise is *yea and amen* that they *will* be granted to all who seek for them aright.

Touching *temporal* blessings, however, we should always cherish the humble conviction that we are not competent judges whether our real good will be promoted by them; and therefore our prayers should be always qualified with an entire resignation to God's will, and a sincere wish that that and not our's should be done; and that He will dispose of us, and of all that concerns us, so as most effectually to advance His glory, and our spiritual and eternal benefit.

The infinite *goodness* of our God should lead us to faithful and affectionate constancy in our prayers to Him, and firm reliance on His willingness to hear us, and to do for us more than either we desire or deserve; and give us the confiding and cheerful certainty that if what we ask is not received, it is because He mercifully withholds what He knows will not bring us the real good we want, and therefore grants us *this* rather than what we mistakingly desired.

In the infinite *power* of Him to Whom we pray, we see the consoling and supporting pledge of His all-sufficiency for the supply of His creatures' needs; while His *majesty* and *glory* should fill us with the profoundest humility, reverence, and awe; and His infinite *holiness* and *purity* should suggest the sincerity and simplicity of heart, and the chastened and sanctified affections, with which we should come into His presence.

But that view of Him to Whom we pray which mingles in the true Christian's heart with every other, and engages his regard above every other, is presented in His gracious connection with His people as their *reconciled Father in Jesus Christ*. We should come before Him in the exercise of a true and living faith in this His Eternal Son, the Divine Mediator, through Whose atonement and intercession only we can hope that our prayers will enter into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.

As God has been pleased to make prayer a condition of His mercies, we ought not to expect them without it. His *spiritual* blessings we shall, of course, never enjoy, unless we seek them by diligent faithful prayer; and deprived of them we must live without God's favor here, and die without hope of His mercy hereafter.

Whatever *temporal* good we have, the acquisition or preservation of which, and a blessing upon which, have not been sought in prayer, we cannot expect will prove a real benefit, unless this neglect is made a timely subject of deep and true repentance.

Besides this direct benefit of prayer, as a means of the divine blessing, it has many collateral advantages which cannot but recommend it to the sincere and conscientious Christian. It begets and cherishes a *holy reverence of the Great Supreme* very instrumental to the excitement, the proper regulation, and the practical efficiency, of sound religious affection. Humble and heartfelt *confesssion of sin*, and *acts of penitence and contrition*, tend to give wholesome views of the guilt, danger, and degradation of offences against the holy law and will of God; while due attention to those of *praise and thanksgiving*, minister to the elevated enjoyments which infuse into the Christian's soul that love of prayer whence the spiritual character derives so much of comfort to its possessor, and of beauty, interest, and edification to others. That blessed exercise of Christian benevolence which consists in *intercession for our fellow men*, draws more closely the various ties which bind us to them. It brings to remembrance our social duties, domestic, civil, and ecclesiastical, impresses them upon the heart, consecrates

them into evangelical graces by imparting evangelical views and motives in their performance, and invests them with the additional obligations and endearments thence arising; it corrects the spirit of ill-will, animosity, and resentment; and warming the heart with love to all, encourages an especial affection for those whose peculiar relationship leads us most particularly to commend *them* to the protection and blessing of our common Parent. And who can name the benign influences upon individual character, and the social state, of the principles, spirit, and affections which must be nourished by the sincere and faithful acting out of the evangelical precept, "*Pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you!*" When, in the *afflictions* of the present time, we draw near with faith to seek support, consolation, and deliverance from the Father of mercies and God of all comfort, the faith and trust and love thus exercised open the heart to the soothing and cheering influences of the truth that preponderating kindness and mercy are in all His dispensations. When, as they constantly should be, our prayers are offered for the *directing, aiding, and sanctifying influences of divine grace*, we are admonished of their necessity, and of our strictly binding obligation duly to profit by them. He must be hardened indeed who can rise from a prayer for a clean heart and a right spirit, for guidance in the way of newness of life, and ability to walk therein, without firm resolutions and the most strenuous endeavors, in the grace he has sought, to resist the allurements and abandon the service of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and to adorn the doctrine of God his Saviour by a new and holy life. And nothing, surely, can more effectually tend to maintain and strengthen correct views, a just appreciation, and a heart-felt adoption, of the great doctrine of atonement, than the humble, trustful, and affectionate pleading of that atonement in the diligent offering of Christian prayer.

Be, then, our application to that duty a *diligent* one. The neglect of it is truly to live without hope and without God in the world. In private, in the family, at Church, and at the altar, prayer should be our most favorite employment, and therefore engaged in with a constancy and devotion which will show how favorite it is. Its *spirit* should be so faithfully imbibed that in all our intercourse with the world, our engagement in its pursuits, and our enjoyment of its pleasures, men may take knowledge of us that we have been with Jesus, by seeing our Christian consistency and our good works, and that He to Whom all hearts are open, may see that this emanates from a soul thoroughly informed and regulated by the principles of the Gospel, and deeply imbued with its affections and sensibilities. Then may we humbly hope, through the kindness and love of God in Jesus Christ, to pass, in His good time, to that heavenly state, where the need of prayer will cease, and adoration and praise be the everlasting employment of the ransomed of the Lord.

B. T. O.

The Churchman.

New York: Saturday, April 26, 1845.

A very remarkable document will be found on our last page. We need do no more than call attention to it.

We cannot agree with our correspondent "W." that the canon gave the Court "no *express* power to attach conditions or limitations of any kind to the sentence;" for the very word *suspension, as it stands in the canon*, is an *express* grant of power authorizing the Court to inflict deprivation of office for a *limited* time. Suppose the Court had decreed suspension for six months or a year, would any man contend that the canon gave no *express* power to impose such a penalty?

And if not expressly, yet by *necessary implication*, the canon restrains the power of the Court from imposing any other than a deprivation of office for a *limited* time under the name of suspension; for where there is no power to revoke, an unlimited suspension is equivalent to deposition; from which, however, the suspension in the canon needs to be plainly distinguished.

And though the canon does not define *suspension* any more than it defines *admonition* and *deposition*, yet the very position of the word, the necessity of distinguishing it from deposition, and the *fact* of its contemplating no revoking power, have all the force of the plainest definition, and put the meaning of the word beyond reasonable dispute.

As to the argument that the sentence is canonical because expressed in the words of the canon, it is sufficient to say that the same word may have different meanings in different connexions. The word suspension *in the canon* is determined by the context to mean deprivation for a limited time; but in the *sentence* there is nothing to limit its meaning, and it can there signify nothing less than deprivation for an unlimited time.

As to the rule *ut res magis valeat quam pereat*, we have often seen it applied to the construction of *statutes*, but we doubt the propriety of its application to the construction of a *sentence*. A statute is to be so construed that it may stand as a whole, and no part of it fail, and for this reason suspension in the canon must mean a *definite* privation of office since otherwise it fails of effect, and is equivalent to deposition. It is not so easy to see the force of the application of the same rule to a sentence which must stand or fall by the canon; unless the judicial power is to be upheld at all hazards even if it override the legislative.

Will our correspondent pardon us for saying that there seems to us to be a want of clearness in his language as to the difference between an *indefinite* and a *definite* suspension?

By an indefinite suspension we mean a suspension which has no *set* limit. If "W." means any thing else, let him say what he means; but if he allows this meaning, let him tell us in plain terms what the limit is to the suspension (which he denies to be indefinite) of the two Bishops Onderdonk. On such a point there is no room for argument, since a definite suspension has its limit expressed in the sentence, and it is the absence of an expressed limitation, either of time or condition, which makes suspension *in a sentence* indefinite.

But while "W." denies that the suspension is indefinite, he looks about for some power to revoke it, and thinks that the General Convention may be that power. Now a definite suspension needs no revoking power: it expires of itself by the efflux of time or the performance of a condition: and it is only an indefinite suspension which needs to be revoked. And thus while our correspondent contends that the suspension is *not* indefinite, he argues on the assumption that it *is* indefinite.

On the supposition that the suspension is indefinite and therefore revocable our correspondent proceeds to inquire who is to revoke it? and he answers, the General Convention. In reply we deny, 1. that the General Convention has the power to revoke a judicial sentence; and 2. that any such revocation is contemplated by the canon; and we call for the proof from those who maintain the affirmative. To *take away* is an expression of broader meaning, and may be applied to an *illegal* instead of a *legal* sentence.

But "W." has another supposition; viz. that the suspension may be understood to expire with the meeting of the next General Convention. Now these two suppositions rest on opposite and contradictory views of the sentence. The former supposes the suspension to be indefinite or without any set limitation: the latter supposes it to be definite and assigns as its limit the sixth day of October, A. D. 1847. Our correspondent may choose either of these views of the suspension, but he cannot consistently argue on both, and make the suspension definite and indefinite in the same breath. His latter hypothesis is that the sentence is definite and expires in October of 1847; and in this conclusion we should cheerfully acquiesce if it could be shown that such a limitation is either contemplated by the canon or justified by analogous precedents. Until this is made to appear, we must account the suspension to be, considered as decreed by the sentence, indefinite.

But says our correspondent, "If the sentence means an *indefinite* suspension, the canon must mean the same thing—and that settles the point; for it is hard to show that the canon was illegal." What? I am now writing on ruled paper, and my written lines cross the ruled ones in various angles and directions; are the ruled lines therefore crooked because they are crossed by the crooked lines which I have scrawled? The ruler, at least, would say, No! The canon is the *rule*, agreement or disagreement with which makes the sentence to be legal or illegal, and it is out of all reason to argue from the sentence to the canon and from the crookedness of the Court's decision to infer the crookedness of the rule; and so, we apprehend, the RULERS will declare.

The word *suspension* may mean a definite or indefinite deprivation of office according to the context in which it is used. Now we have proved on former occasions, and we do not understand our correspondent to deny, that the word *suspension, as it stands in the canon*, means deprivation of office for a *limited* time. If this is not the meaning of the word, *as it stands in the canon*, let the contrary first be shown; for we contend that no man can express an intelligent opinion of the sentence until he has first determined the meaning of the canon, any more than he can determine whether a line is straight or crooked without a rule by which to compare it. On the other hand it is plain that the word *suspension, as it stands in the sentence*, means deprivation of office for an indefinite time; and the true question is, Is the meaning of the sentence authorized by the canon?

The appearance of a new edition of the "Psalter, Pointed for Chanting," for which the Church and all within it who are anxious for the increased dignity of her worship, are much indebted to its publisher, Mr. Sparks, while it is gratifying as an evidence of a new temper among us, will also we hope incur no prejudice if it is made the occasion by us of bringing out our ideas on the general subject of Psalmody and Ecclesiastical Music.

First, of the latter. We lay down the broad, what may seem to some the sweeping assertion, that no chants are better adapted to our Church service than the Gregorian tones, as they are commonly known among us. True, with most members of our Church we know but little of the Gregorian music in its purity and under favorable circumstances; true also that we are not ignorant of the inimitable beauty, nay, (in the abstract,) the suitableness of many productions of English masters, still, so strong is the *a priori* argument that even were our experience in the matter much less than it is, we should not at all be tempted to modify the rule. For these tones come down to us stamped with the approval of the Christian Church during its entire existence, hallowed by the use of saints and martyrs in all ages, coeval with the collects and prayers which we use daily, a chain by which we are bound in the Communion of Saints, and in their simplicity and majesty the only fitting exponents of those wonderful productions which once chanted around the ark and in the temple, nay, by Miriam and the daughters of Israel on the shores of the Red Sea, have ever been the essential part of Christian congregational worship, as well as the comfort and spiritual reward of private members of Christ's body.

The history of the Gregorian tones may be stated with sufficient exactness for our present purpose, by reminding those who may read us that they were compiled by Gregory, a bishop of Rome, in the 6th century, from those at that time and previously in use in the Church, that they were introduced into England by Augustine of Canterbury soon after, and have been preserved, on the Continent at least, with the most jealous watchfulness to this day. Now, setting out of view the strong evidence (presumptive) that among them are some which were used by our Lord and his Apostles, and before them in the Temple worship; and this is all the stronger when we recall the tendency among Eastern Christians to adopt as much as possible of Jewish usages, let us not omit a consideration of the influences acting on primitive music, which were derived directly from the heathen and sanctified by the adoption as were the innumerable temples of heathen deities when devoted to Christian worship. Of the four *modes* or νόμοι among the Greeks, the Doric, the Phrygian, the Ionic, and Lydian, "the Church," according to Mr. Newman, "adopted the Doric music and forbade the Ionic and Lydian." Such a regulation, whether a positive injunction or the result of long usage, will be understood by any one who considers the characteristics of the Dorians, a race whose simple manners, strict discipline, and purity of life have marked them out as in many respects a proper model for Christian commonwealths. But the actual features of this *mode* are so well depicted by the author of the History of the Dorians, that we feel sure an extract will not be amiss.

"The Dorians of Peloponnesus, the genuine Greeks, cultivated music to a greater degree than any other of the Grecian tribes, before the time when this far-famed school of Asia flourished. We are warranted in assuming that it was not merely the external influence of the Doric race which gave their name to this mode, from the close affinity it bears to the character of the nation. The ancients, who were infinitely quicker in discovering the moral character of music than can be the case in modern times, attributed to it something solemn, firm, and manly, calculated to inspire fortitude in supporting misfortunes and hardships, and to strengthen the mind against the attacks of passion. They discovered in it a calm sublimity and a simple grandeur which bordered upon severity, equally opposed to inconstancy and enthusiasm; and this is precisely the character we find so strongly impressed on the religion, arts, and manners of the Dorians. The severity and rudeness of this music (which appeared gloomy and harsh to the later ages, and would be still more so to our ears, accustomed to a softer style) was strikingly contrasted with the mild and pleasing character which had then long pervaded the Epic poetry."—*Muller's Dorians*, B. iv. chap. 6, sec. 2.

This is not a place to enter fully into questions of this nature, otherwise the tendency of the Dorian music and its close connection with integrity of religion and purity of life might be illustrated abundantly from ancient authors. We refer only to the Ranæ of Aristophanes for some curious evidences of the estimation in which it was held as compared with a later and emasculated style, and remark merely that very close parallels can be run between the latter or Euripidean *mode* (afterwards adopted by Arius in his Thalia) and the trifling opera music which to so lamentable an extent obtains in our Churches to the actual defrauding of the worshippers and the desecration of our solemn services.

Whether viewed then as of Hebrew or Heathen origin, the wisdom of the Church's sanction is abundantly justified from the nature of the music itself, for the temple chants of course would claim the veneration of Christians, and the Dorian character was of all others the nearest to that of which they were the pattern. Of these primitive chants then, the existing Gregorian tones are the lineal decendants and representatives, and as such they claim the attentive consideration, nay more, the adoption of every member of the Christian Church, until something better, that is, more suitable can be found. Not something prettier, or more elegant, or more refined, but something more suitable to a particular purpose, and for this purpose we are not at all fearful that any thing more suitable will ever be discovered.

This purpose then is the congregational recitation of the Psalms. *Recitation* we say, for it is generally forgotten that chanting is (not singing, not a musical performance, but) a *repeating* in a somewhat more dignified tone than that of ordinary conversation. *Intonation* would perhaps be a more proper word by which to characterize it, as differing from reading on the one hand, and singing on the other; for both these imply an attempt at *effective* utterance, that is, an aim to produce some effect on the person addressed. But surely nothing should be further from our thoughts in addressing Almighty GOD than this desire; "not my will but thine be done" is the Christian temper, even in the earnestness of prayer. Much more should an utterance implying it be avoided in psalmody, the vehicle of praise. And this being the nature of chanting, it is as obviously the duty of the whole congregation to assist in it as in prayer, and any system which tends to limit them in this respect is, in so far, utterly unwarrantable. What systems are liable to this charge, and to what extent the Gregorian chants obviate such an evil, must be left for future consideration.

B.

THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.—*A Lecture delivered in the Hall of the Western University of Pennsylvania, on Tuesday Evening, Feb. 4, 1845.* By GEORGE UPFOLD, M. D., D. D., Pittsburgh: Geo. Parkin, Fourth street.

We have been much interested in this address, the aim of which is sufficiently indicated by its title. Dr. Upfold examines the workings of our political, social and religious system for the last century in a way which satisfies us that he has given the whole subject an unbiassed attention; and not the most trifling evidence of this is, that on one subject at least he has been obliged to take a position not at all in harmony with the sentiments of many well meaning persons in the community. The extract which we give will we suppose denote the subject in question, and we can only say of the whole address, that as it treats of matters which should be examined by the Christian as well as the political economist, so are we well satisfied that they have fallen into the hands of the present author.

By *Moral Aspect*, I mean, not its religious, but its intellectual, in contradistinction to its political and physical character: the operation of mind on mind, in science, education and general literature, its agencies and its results. Yet, in a strict religious point of view, this period of the world's history is far from being wanting in much that is remarkable, nay truly wonderful; and were this the proper time and place for such discussion, it would afford interesting and instructive topics of consideration. But the discussion is of too sacred a nature to be introduced here and on this occasion. And besides, what I might have to say in relation to it, might be regarded as affected by professional and ecclesiastical bias, and my candor be suspected and my supposed prejudices magnified. This much, however, I may be permitted to say, as a general result of my observation, knowledge and reflection, and I trust without offence or unfavorable imputation; that although religion, during the period in question, particularly of late years, has occupied an unusually large share of public attention, it is much to be feared, this attention has been more formal, than practical and fruitful in good; and that there is a seeming unreality in its personal influence and exemplification, disproportioned to the various, cumulative, and, in some instances, magnificently conceived plans for its spread and progress, which the age has brought forth. It has been very much the fashion to be religious in a certain way and to a certain extent, to engage in the promotion of popular religious measures, and to talk and gossip about religion. But the beneficial influence of the religious movements of the period on the actual moral improvement of our race, in the true and permanent bettering of the inward man, and in the sum of religion in its reality; if we may judge from the prevailing tone of public sentiment every where, the loose principles, the vitiated taste of the times, the singular want of probity, the wholesale frauds of individuals and corporate associations, and the vast increase of vice and crime, with the countenance they receive, or the stern rebuke they fail to receive, in quarters where the former is not, and the latter is to be expected; the influence of these movements is small and meagre, in proportion to the number and variety of the schemes they embrace, and the immense expenditure of money and effort and glowing speeches in their prosecution. In morals strictly, the world appears to have gone back, rather than forward. One cause of this may be, the mechanical character, so to speak, of most of the enterprises set on foot and attempted to be carried on. And in some instances, may it not be inferred from the nature of the agencies employed, nay courted—agencies of an extraneous and exceedingly questionable character, in reference to which, on the slightest reflection, and at the first blush, the emphatic disclaimer would spontaneously spring up,

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis,
Opus eget?

THE COLUMBIAN MAGAZINE, (Israel Post, No. 3 Astor House.) We have seen several numbers of this very handsome periodical, and from the few articles we have looked at think it a pleasing collection of light reading. It is edited by Messrs. John Inman and Robert A. West, and has a valuable list of contributors: pp. 48 monthly. Price $3 per annum, or $5 for two copies.

It affords us a melancholy pleasure to comply with the request of Mr. Winston, the clerk of the Vestry of St. George's Church, by inserting the resolutions of the Vestry on occasion of the decease of its late revered and lamented rector. Seldom is a tribute of reverence and affection for a deceased pastor more happily expressed or more justly bestowed.

☞ A sermon will be preached by the Rev. Mr. VINTON and a collection made in behalf of the Ladies' Depository, on Sunday evening, the 27th inst., at St. Thomas's Church. We take the liberty of recommending this highly deserving institution, which both in its design and management reflects so much credit on those who direct it, to the liberality of Churchmen, and hope that its just claims will be generously recognized.

We cannot better further the design of the writer of the annexed letter than by publishing it as it is:

"My Dear ——: I have just observed in the Churchman of this week, a notice for a meeting, the object of which is to form "An Anglo-American Free Church" in the city: and very great pleasure has this notice given me; for such a church will be of immense advantage, I doubt not, for the members of the Church of England coming to this country. But my principal object in writing on this subject is to beg you to bring before the minds of the gentlemen concerned in this worthy enterprise the necessity of seeing to the interests of the many English and a few (but generally worthy) *Irish* Protestants, who, merely stopping in New York for a short time, finally find their way into *the country*. If *these* emigrants are not seen after, as well as those who remain in the city, but comparatively little good can be done. Unless they are furnished with some means of making themselves known to the ministers and brethren of their own Church, in this country, I have much reason for knowing that they are liable to be perverted from their Church. I would therefore beg you, if you can find leisure to do so, to suggest to the gentlemen engaged in this excellent undertaking, of forming a church for emigrants remaining in the city, the duty also of furnishing those who *leave* the city, the means of making themselves speedily known to the minister of the church into whose neighborhood they may chance to go. Beg them when they form their church in the city, to have an eye to this matter. *All that is necessary is, to instruct the minister of the church, or any proper person appointed for the purpose, to supply emigrants leaving the city, with letters to the minister of the church to whom they will be nearest.* They may be assured that this simple and easy expedient will contribute in no small degree to keep our foreign brethren within the safe enclosure of the true fold.

I have thrown out these hints very hastily, and on the spur of the moment, but have felt urged to do so, from a deep sympathy which I feel with the projectors of the "Anglo-American Church," and from a sincere desire to make the effects of their benevolence as widely felt as possible.

Very truly your friend, ——.

By the *Caledonia* we have English dates to the 4th of April, and adjoin a few extracts containing the principal matters of importance to Church readers.

The chief topic of "ecclesiastical agitators" at present seems to be the proposed increase of the Government grant to Maynooth College from 8 to 26,000 pounds, which has excited great alarms for the safety of the Protestant establishment in Ireland, evinced not only in meetings and petitions, but in the fraternization of men heretofore possessed of no common feeling. But we shall reserve our ideas on this subject till another opportunity.

One of our extracts from the English Churchman sufficiently indicates the state of affairs at Oxford. The signatures of members of Convocation (virtually) in favor of Tract XC. are 542 to "nearly 500" against it. The *tolerators* of its principles may congratulate themselves that the University to which all eyes were so lately turned will *not* tolerate any harsh and vindictive measures. As to Mr. Oakeley we learn from one of the papers that proceedings are to be instituted against him in the Court of Arches with reference to his letter to the Bishop of London.

Besides Dr. Turton's elevation to the See of Ely (a choice no better than we expected, but which at any rate shows that a different qualification for the Episcopate is now demanded from that of having edited a Greek play) we notice the appointment of a new colonial bishop, viz. the Rev. Jas. Chapman, to the lately created diocese of Ceylon. Dr. Medley is the Bishop elect of New Brunswick.

AND so DRS. FAUSSETT and ELLERTON—those two sagacious and learned champions of orthodoxy—have been unable, after all, to muster 500 signatures to their requisition respecting No. XC.! 540 members of Convocation have thanked the Proctors for exercising their most extreme prerogative of *voting* a certain measure of persecution before it was submitted to the House, and "nearly 500" urge the renewal of the attack. Surely the Heads of Houses cannot say that severity is forced upon them from without: the responsibility of any fresh step must rest entirely with themselves. Convocation, in so far as its opinions have been expressed, is decidedly unfavorable to a renewal of the prosecution. But the argument which we are concerned at this moment to press is, that if Mr. Oakeley is left to be dealt with by his diocesan, much more should Mr. Newman be. Mr. Oakeley, as he informs us in his letter to the Bishop of London, retains his rooms in college, and frequently occupies them. Mr. Newman, it is well known, has entirely ceased to reside in Oriel, or to take any part in the concerns of the University. For all practical purposes he is as completely *extra academicam* as if he resided at York instead of Littlemore; and, therefore, in all fairness, ought not to be considered amenable to academical tribunals unless Convocation is prepared to deal summarily with all delinquents, from Dublin to Knockholt.

THE SEE OF ELY.—The following official notice appeared in *The London Gazette* of Tuesday:—

WHITEHALL, March 29.

The Queen has been pleased to order a *conge d'elire* to pass the Great Seal, empowering the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Ely to elect a Bishop of that See, the same being void by the death of Doctor Joseph Allen, late Bishop thereof; and her Majesty has also been pleased to recommend to the said Dean and Chapter, Thomas Turton, Doctor in Divinity, now Dean of the Cathedral Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to be by them elected Bishop of the said See.

We are assured that Archdeacon Samuel Wilberforce is to be the new Dean of Westminster.—*Standard.*

ELY.—*Funeral of Bishop Allen.*—On Tuesday, at one o'clock, P. M., the mortal remains of the late Right Rev. Bishop Allen were deposited in a vault in the choir of the Cathedral, and in front of the altar. On Monday afternoon, at five o'clock, the Minor Canon, the private friends of the late Bishop, and his Lordship's tradesmen, with their families, were admitted to the chapel, where the body lay in state. The coffin was covered with rich purple velvet. The furniture of the coffin was gilt, the mitre forming a prominent ornament. On the lid of the coffin was a gilt plate, whereon were engraved the name, title, and age of his Lordship; a little above that was another plate, on which were engraved the arms of the deceased Prelate, and those of the See of Ely. The room was hung with black and lighted with tapers. The ceremonial was imposing and affecting.

It is stated, upon something like authority, that the Rev. Mr. Ward will not prosecute the suit with which he threatened the University of Oxford, for the recovery of his degrees. The case of the Rev. Frederick Oakeley will come on, it is said, by letters of request, in the ensuing term in the Court of Arches.

Dr. Wolff arrived at Constantinople on the 22d Feb. and was to leave London by the Oriental Steam Company's packet.

The state of health of the Bishop of Calcutta has compelled him to quit his post, and he is now on his way to England.

DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS.—*Appointments by the Bishop for the months of April and May.*—Tuesday, April 22, Quincy. Wednesday, 23, Hanover and Marshfield. Thursday, 24, Plymouth. Tuesday, May 6, Taunton. Wednesday, 7, Bridgewater. Thursday, 8, New Bedford. Friday, 9, Fall River. Sunday, 18, Chelsea. Thursday, 22, Springfield. Friday, 23, Northampton. Sunday, 25, Greenfield and Montagu. Tuesday, 27, Ashfield. Wednesday, 28, Lanesborough.—*Witness.*

DIOCESE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.—At an ordination held in Trinity Church, Claremont, on the first Sunday after Easter, (March 30,) Mr. Daniel Grosvenor Wright was admitted to the holy order of deacons by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Chase. Morning Prayer was read by the Rev. Mr. Staples, of Cornish. The sermon, which was admirable, was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Sprague, of Drewsville, his text being Acts vi. 1, 2, 3, 4. The candidate was presented by the Rev. Mr. Sprague.—*Ib.*

To Correspondents.

Columba No. 2 we had intended to insert this week, but are obliged to defer to our next.

An Obituary, accidentally overlooked, shall appear next week.

It having pleased the Great Head of the Church to remove most suddenly by death, on Tuesday night, the eighth of April, 1845, the Rev. JAMES MILNOR, D.D., in the seventy-third year of his age, and the twenty-ninth of his rectorship of this parish, this Vestry being desirous of placing on record an expression of their profound grief at this bereavement, and the irreparable loss sustained therein by the congregation, direct the following resolutions to be entered upon their minutes:

Resolved, That while we deeply grieve under this chastisement of Almighty God in the removal of His distinguished servant our pastor, from his stewardship among us, we bow in humble submission to His sovereign will, and would say, "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."

Resolved, That while we sorrow with the Church at large that "a great man has fallen in our Israel," whose talents, learning, wisdom, moderation, benevolence, purity, and fervent piety caused his influence to be widely felt in all the great designs for promoting the temporal and eternal welfare of mankind,—yet as individuals and a congregation, we feel the liveliest grief for the loss of a spiritual father, a faithful pastor, an eloquent and scriptural preacher of the Gospel, who "divided to each of us his portion in due season;" a wise counsellor, a tender and considerate friend, who shared and sympathized in our sorrows and our joys; and who by his spotless integrity, Christian courtesy, and purity of life, not less than by his public instructions, taught us alike our duty to God and our fellow men.

Resolved, That we will cherish as a precious legacy the remembrance of his pastoral fidelity, high intellectual endowments, Catholic principles, and fervent charity; and trust it may please the Great Head of the Church to send one like-minded "to go in and out among us to break the bread of eternal life."

Resolved, That we tenderly sympathize with his bereaved and afflicted family so suddenly smitten while providentially separated, and fervently pray that the "Father of the fatherless and the widow's God" may console them with the blessings of His Providence and grace, assuage their sorrows by the consciousness that their loss is his unspeakable gain, and unite them "a family in heaven," whither their revered parent and head has so suddenly been called to precede them.

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing resolutions be presented to the family of our deceased Rector.

From the Minutes.

FREDERICK S. WINSTON, Clerk.

New York, Thursday, April 17, 1845.

Married.

On Thursday evening, April 17th, by the Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D., WILLIAM E. CHEESMAN to SOPHIA D., daughter of Cornelius Oakley, Esq., all of this city.

On the evening of the 22d inst., by the Rev. B. C. C. Parker, of the Floating Church of our Saviour, WATSON GEORGE HAYNES to SARAH KINGSTON BURNSIDE, of New York.

Died.

At the residence of his son, the Rev. Anthony Ten Broeck, rector of Grace Church, Newark, N. J., on Friday morning, 18th inst., HENRY A. TEN BROECK, of this city, in the 59th year of his age.

Calendar.

April.

27. Fifth Sunday after Easter, or Rogation Sunday.
28. }
29. } Rogation Days.
30. }

May.

1. The ASCENSION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, and St. Philip and St. James, the Apostles.
4. Sunday after Ascension-Day.
11. WHITSUNDAY.
12. Monday in Whitsun-Week.
13. Tuesday in Whitsun-Week.
14. }
16. } Ember Days.
17. }
18. TRINITY SUNDAY.
25. First Sunday after Trinity.

Notices.

☞ A Sermon will be preached on Sunday evening next, in St. Bartholomew's, by Rev. C. H. WILLIAMSON, on the religious state of France, and on the spiritual wants of the French population in this city. A collection will be taken up in behalf of the French Church Du Saint-Sauveur. Service to begin at 7½ o'clock. All are respectfully invited to attend.

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, Brooklyn, having been enlarged during the past winter, *any* persons desiring seats, or families pews, will apply to the Sexton at the church, or at 250 Adams street. April 26—3t

Acknowledgments.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.—Since his acknowledgment of the 16th of April, the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

From St Mark's ch, Warren, R I, Christmas S S offerings, for missions in Illinois, $6 37; general, $16 20; parish of Trinity ch, New Haven, per Rev Dr Croswell, $100; for missions in Georgia, $2 50; Rev Stephen Douglass, $5; missionary station, Little Rock, Ark, half, $9 42; St Peter's ch, Plymouth, Ct, Rev William Watson, rector, $18; mite box of Mrs C B and children of Plattsburgh, N Y, $2 25; Trinity ch, Washington, D C, Rev H Stringfellow, rector, $55 12; Zion ch, Wappinger's Creek, N Y, per Rev G B Andrew's, half, $8; Nashotah Mission, $7 83; Madison, Ind, $3; West Baton Rouge, La, $20; Indianapolis, Ind, $7 60; St Matthew's ch, Jersey City, N J, per Rev E D Barry, D D, $13 70; Emmanuel ch, Brooklyn, L I, $3; from a member of do, half, $4 02. Total, $282 01.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
April 23, 1845. 139 Broadway, New York.

N. B. The treasurer would state for the information of the clergy and others, that the treasury is *not only empty*, but has been overdrawn more than $1,000, while about two thirds of the Missionaries are unpaid. It is deemed needless to refer to the inconvenience and probable distress which will be occasioned if funds are not promptly remitted.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.—The Treasurer of the Foreign Committee since his last report of the 14th inst, has received the following sums:

From St Michael's ch, Bristol, R I, per Rev J W Cook, rector, February collection for foreign missions, $4 67; April do, for Constantinople, $34 08—$38 75; from Trinity parish, New Haven, Ct, per Rev Dr Croswell, rector, $100; for China, $8 50; S school of St George's ch, N Y, Christmas offering, from Gustavus, Mary, and Frederick, fruits of self-denial, for education of "Horatio Gillett," Africa, under Rev J Payne, 2d annual payment, $20; for China, $14 12; St George's ch, for support of beneficiary at Athens, $80; anonymous, N Y, $10; S school of Trinity ch, Newport, R I, for education of 'Maria Brown Vinton,' Africa, $20; and 1st half yearly payment for support of Francis Vinton, Africa, $10; Sunday school of the Ch of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, for support of beneficiary at Athens, $80; for support of 5 children in Africa, $100; for Greece, $20; Ladies' Sewing Society, for Africa, $300; collection for Africa, $305 37—$805 37; Easter offerings of children of Sunday school of St John's ch, Hartford, Ct, per A C Coxe, for Constantinople, $1; for China, $4; Africa, $5—$10; Christ ch, Springfield, O, per Rev M T C Wing, for Africa, $5; St Peter's ch, Plymouth, Ct, Rev W Watson, rector, half, $4; do, for China, $2; Sunday school, do, for support of Theophilus Morris, Africa, $20; do, do, for Constantinople, $25—$51; S S of St John's ch, Elizabethtown, N J, for education in Greece, $8; through Rev Mr Syle, for China, from Christ ch, Washington City, $10; St Peter's ch, Baltimore, $50; children of Rev J McJilton, $2 10; family of L B M, $15—$77 10; Trinity ch, Washington, D C, per Rev H Stringfellow, for education of H Stringfellow and Seth Todd, Africa, $40; Easter offerings of the church, for China, $27 56; do, for Africa, $27 56—$95 12; through Rev W H Barnwell, rector, from St Peter's ch, Charleston, S C, Working Society, for beneficiary at Athens, $80; St Peter's col'd school, for Africa, $10; a lady of St Peter's, for church at Houston, $5; offerings at Greenville, per Rev Mr Denison, $6 50; Zion ch, Wappinger's Creek, per Rev G B Andrews, rector, half, $8; S school, Christ ch, Louisville, Ky, balance of pledge for Constantinople, $12 50; for China, $3; Emmanuel ch, Brooklyn, L I, for Constantinople, $9 50; a member of do, half, $4 02; through Rev S Hazlehurst, particulars to be given hereafter, $1100. Total, $2591 48.

J. SMYTH ROGERS, Treasurer,
New York, April 23, 1845. 57 Wall-st.

NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:—

From Rev Charles B Stout, Painesville, Ohio, $4 50; St Paul's ch, Poughkeepsie, Rev Dr Milledoler, $10; Christ ch, Hudson, Ohio, Rev Alanson Phelps, $5; Miss C S Edwards, New Haven, annual, $2. Total amount, $21 50.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, April 23, 1845.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.—The treasurer thankfully acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:—

From Rev Charles B Stout, Painesville, Ohio, $1 50; Miss Edwards, New Haven, annual, $1; Silas Sprague, Hudson, do, $1. Total amount, $3 50.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, April 23, 1845.

COMMERCIAL COLLEGIATE SCHOOL,
43 West Washington Place.

MESSRS. HUBBS & CLARKE are encouraged to believe that their efforts in thorough English and Classical Instruction have met the approbation of their patrons and friends. Their School is at present composed of the sons of professional gentlemen and Christian families generally; and, with the exception of several young men who are pursuing an advanced course of study, the ages of the pupils vary from 9 to 15 years. Provision has lately been made for the admission of a small number of younger scholars about the first of May. Parents who may wish to place their children under our instruction, are invited to call at the School between the hours of eight and four o'clock, or, if more convenient, to send us a note through the Post Office, to which prompt attention will be paid, and any information that may be desired relative to terms of tuition, studies, &c. will be cheerfully given.

Approved masters of French, Drawing, and Penmanship, as well as other assistants, are employed for the benefit of the pupils.

ISAAC G. HUBBS, }
GEORGE W. CLARKE, } *Principals.*

P. S. Circulars, and references of the highest character, may be obtained at the School rooms; and personal interviews with the Principals for more definite information, may be had at the residence of Mr. Hubbs, 229 Fifth street, or of Mr. Clarke, 46 West Washington Place. April 26—3t$

CLASSICAL AND ENGLISH SCHOOL,
In the Hall 183 Canal st., near Hudson street.

THE advertiser has been a teacher for a number of years in this city, and the Principal of the above School two years.

Arrangements have been made for accommodating a select number of pupils, and it is desired by the Principal that his scholars should be the children of Churchmen, and his school a Church School.

Churchmen moving in this vicinity, and others wishing to encourage such a School and to share the benefits to be derived therefrom, will not be disappointed in placing their children under the care of the Principal.

Terms $25 per year, payable quarterly in advance.

Particular attention paid to Vocal Music and instruction on the Piano Forte.

☞ The above sum includes instruction in all the English studies pursued in the School, also the rudiments of the Latin language. No charge for fuel or stationery. [Ap 26.] WM. B. STOUGHTON.

BOARDING SCHOOL, SING SING.

MARLBOROUGH CHURCHILL, PRINCIPAL.—Mr. Churchill having removed to the building erected for and formerly used as a Female Seminary, but lately known as the Mountain House, will commence his Summer session on Wednesday, April 30th.

The comfortable arrangement of the building, the beauty and healthiness of the location, the convenience of access from the city, the beautiful, retired and extensive grounds so well adapted for the Military and other exercises of the School are unsurpassed. The Principal is a graduate of the U. S. Military Academy at West Point and instructs in the Mathematical branches principally. The other departments are filled by teachers of unquestioned ability.

The terms are $230 per annum. The French is a part of the regular course of studies, and involves no extra charge. Circulars containing list of references and other information may be obtained at M. H. Newman's, No. 199 Broadway, J. B. Wood's, No. 14 Wall street, and office of the Evening Gazette, No. 47 William street. The Principal refers particularly to the patrons of the Institution, of whom the following are a part:—Charles King, Esq., Hon. B. F. Butler, Gen. C. W. Sandford, Wm. Bamewall, Esq., Talman J. Waters, Esq., Isaac Gibson, Esq., Chas. Kneeland, Esq., James Smith, Esq., C. Du Bois, jr., Esq., Col. J. B. Wood, New York city; N. Leavenworth, Esq., Elizabethtown, N. J.; Gen. S. Van Rensselaer, Albany; Archibald Gracie, Esq., W. R. Hallett, Esq., Mobile, Ala.; Edwin Post, Esq., Stanhope, N. J.; Col. James S. McIntosh, U. S. Army, Hon. Chas. A. Wickliffe, of Kentucky; Rev. A. Jones, D. D., Charlestown, Va.
April 26—3t$

CHURCH MUSIC.

THE subscribers, at the earnest solicitations of many of their friends, have been induced to enter into arrangements for the purpose of forming a Singing School, in which particular attention will be paid to the Music of the Episcopal Church.

All who are desirous of aiding the above undertaking and improving themselves in Music of so important a character, thereby fitting themselves to perform in a proper manner their part in the service of the Church, are respectfully invited to attend the introductory lesson to the Course, on Friday evening, May 2d, in the Hall 183 Canal street, near Hudson street, at half past 7 o'clock, P. M.

The subscribers pledge themselves that every exertion will be used to enable the pupils to sing the music of the Church in a proper style, and to make their advancement as rapid as possible.

Terms, for the course, for a gentleman and lady, payable in advance, $3. Single tickets for gentlemen, $2. Single tickets for ladies, $1 50.

Saturdays will be devoted exclusively to the instruction of children. Terms in this department will be very moderate, that all may avail themselves of the present opportunities.

WILLIAM B. STOUGHTON,
JAMES A. JOHNSON,
April 26. W. H. WALTER.

THE REV. J. A. SPENCER, A.M., will remove his Select School for Boys to No. 208 Wooster street, between Amity and Bleecker, on the first of May, inst. By a slight change in his arrangements boys pursuing English studies only can be admitted at a reduced price. April 26—4t

THEOLOGICAL BOOKS.—The undersigned having enlarged their Bookstore, and fitted up a Reading Room which will be supplied with the various Church periodicals, respectfully invite the attention of Clergymen and others to their establishment.

All the standard Theological works published in this country constantly on hand, and for sale at the most reasonable prices. Sunday School and Parish Libraries furnished at a discount.

They also offer for sale a general assortment of Classical, School and Miscellaneous Books and Stationery in every variety.

☞ Orders from the country punctually attended to.
HENRY M. ONDERDONK & CO.
April 26—4t 25 John street.

NEW STANDARD EDITION

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER—five different sizes. D. APPLETON & Co. will shortly publish The Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church, printed from the *authorized* copy adopted at the last General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the proof sheets corrected by one of the three Presbyters appointed by the House of Bishops for its revision. Illustrated with four very fine engravings on steel, from the unique designs of Overbeck, and a finely executed illuminated title page. It will be published in five varieties of size, embracing 8vo., 12mo., 16mo., 24mo., and 18mo. The type of the last two sizes will be larger than any previous edition. April 26.

The following proceeding from the Records of the Parish of St. Peter's Church, Ashtabula, Ohio, was, by permission of the Wardens, and Vestrymen, and by request, put in type, and a few copies ordered for circulation:

St. Peter's Church, Ashtabula, Ohio,
Monday, in Easter Week, A. D., 1845.

The undersigned, members of the parish attached to this church, also embracing the entire Vestry of the same, being together, and engaged in an interchange of opinion upon the late trial and sentence of the Rt. Rev. Bishop of New York, with the train of causes which preceded, and the testimony and spirit which produced the result, and *finding* themselves to be of one mind as to the character of the proceeding, *unanimously* agreed upon the following expression of their views, and ordered the same to be entered upon the parish Records, for the examination of their successors.

As members of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of our Lord and Saviour, we esteem it both a privilege and duty to be in communion and charity with each other, and every other member of the same body. By charity, we mean an active living state of the affections, by which we are not only drawn to the extent of our ability to impart aid to all in affliction, especially to those of the same household, the Church, but in all our dealings with, and especially in our estimate of other men's characters and motives, to be influenced by a spirit of love. We mean also, a real communion, not only in a common Faith, a common Saviour, common Sacraments and common hopes of a blessed Immortality, but also in a common household, the Church, in which all its members have, or ought to have, a common sympathy in each other's joys and sorrows—a sympathy which not only keeps steadily in view, and is instructed and governed by the moral law of God; but as we hope ourselves to be forgiven, by the law of mercy also procured by means of our blessed Saviour. That in all matters of discipline, by those whom God has set over us in his Church, whether among themselves or dispensed to us, whatever difference in other respects may prevail, the same spirit of love is indispensable. That where this spirit is driven out by angry controversies, envy, ambition, lust of power and influence, or any other instrument of the world, the flesh, and the devil, its place is as sure to be supplied by blind zeal, bigotry and intolerance, as those are certain of being the first victims concerning whom our Saviour said, of such is the kingdom of Heaven. In such a state of the Church neither malicious tale bearers, whisperers, false accusers and witnesses, nor blind judges will be wanting to condemn the innocent.

Further—in matters of discipline affecting our rulers, we take a distinction between cases involving private, and such as directly affect public or official character in this, that the secret sins of men are in their effects limited; while heresy, schism, or other public and aggravated sins know no bounds. The private character of ministers of all grades, may only affect their personal salvation, and ordinarily at most concern their own peculiar charge; while their official acts or public delinquences in the performance of all prescribed offices of religion, in all cases, influence the destinies of others. We further note that breaches of the moral law by ministers of religion, although obviously more aggravated and less excusable, is yet of the nature of like sins by other men; while wilful official delinquency proceeding either from false notions of Christianity or malice, not only involves the first, but being done in the name of, and by assumed authority of God, is manifestly in some sense a sin against the Holy Ghost, and therefore more aggravated and injurious, requiring corresponding increase of interest and exertion for correction. We are more confirmed in the force of the foregoing outlines by reference to the history of the Church. We find so far as we are informed, that all agitations of sufficient power and extent, to call together large numbers of the clergy, for the trial of an accused brother, have been directly for or connected with, charges for real or supposed heresy or schism; while all cases embracing private character only, unless embracing whole establishments, and of an highly aggravated character, have been disposed of in a quiet manner, and corrected by private admonition; or when conducted under the form of a trial, so managed as to avoid scandal, or unhealthy agitation. We cite the case of the proceedings had against the present Bishop of Kentucky. This seems to have been conducted upon principles parental, mild, and yet efficient. Our ears were not offended by whisperers and tale bearers; no more attention seems to have been given to it, than was necessary to ensure a thorough and candid investigation; no midnight or secret conventicles by our clergy; no disturbing of the peace of other dioceses; no exertions so extraordinary as to be indicative of wrath in hunting up witnesses; no unnecessary attendance of bishops from all parts of the Union.

The case of St. Athanasius is of an opposite character—strong and marked. A case exhibiting an attempt to destroy a man of sound faith and pure morals, under a false plea of vindicating the Church; an attempt to render unpopular a system of theology by convicting its advocate of ungodly living; to get rid of heresy, (so assumed to be believed by his accusers,) not by trying its advocate for his alleged unsoundness in faith, but by falsely accusing him of crimes. A case so distinctly marked could not, it would seem, occur in our day; but such, however, as are of the same class may happen, when the Church in any country shall be in hot haste for proselyting, and hurriedly filling its ranks from the world; when splendid projects and passionate appeals of man's wisdom, shall be in higher estimation than the humble every day means of God's appointment; when high places shall be fearfully multiplying, and filled in haste by men of unsubdued tempers, and conceited imaginations; when mere ambition, showy talents and attainments shall be more highly thought of, than solid learning, sound practical sense, and a humble self-sacrificing spirit; when under a fond imagination, and puritanical profession, of extending the dominion of true godliness in the hearts of men, things of mere personal vanity and human invention shall be sought to be built up; when humble minded and laborious clergymen in the country, are cramped in their devoted exertions for want of bread; while thousands of dollars are lavishly expended in establishing and keeping up premature diocesan organizations, and in founding and endowing seminaries of all sorts of learning—overlooking the plain and undoubted requirements of the day, in a vain imagination and lavish expenditure for the uncertain future; overbalancing all possible good to be expected from such schemes, by the positive certainty of laying a foundation for strifes, jealousies and contentions; creating and multiplying constant and pressing appeals for new and supposed charities, and thus drying up the regular channels of supplies for the Church, in its '*general*,' regular, and every day ministrations; weakening and distracting the old and established provisions made for the whole Church, for the steady growth, unity and charity of the whole by arraying against them and each other, a multitude of separate and distinct claims, antagonistic influences, schools and seminaries independent of the Church and of each other, which beget new and untried theories and systems, with the new vamping of old and rejected ones; in short, presenting the whole Church in a false character of unfolding a spotted banner, confused, distracting and unintelligible.

Further: we may expect the occurrence of scenes similar to those in the life of Athanasius, when the low state of evangelical piety and true Christianity shall be made manifest in the fears of the clergy to hold up in bold and palpable relief the example and teachings of our Saviour, step by step, as outlined in our Prayer Book, from the manger to the cross, and the practices of the Apostles and first Christians, as always applicable in spirit to all times. When men shall in the 19th century dare excuse themselves in delinquency by saying "the Church will not bear it," otherwise; when the sacraments, the rites and ordinances in the holy keeping of the Church shall be overshadowed in a pretended zeal and exclusive love for the Gospel; thus attempting to separate what God has joined in one system, and demolishing the whole; when by a general disuse of any of the means of God's appointment men become blind to their meaning, and cease to be affected in their only occasional use: or dread to look their sins in the face by the frequent, solemn and searching administration and reception of the holy communion.

The undersigned having carefully examined the proceedings of the late trial of the Bishop of New York, and tested the same by the foregoing principles, do now proceed to note our exceptions, as follows:—We object to the canon under which he was tried, as making no distinction between discipline on account of private morals, intended primarily and principally for the benefit of the supposed erring brother, and discipline for official misconduct, which is mainly intended to protect the Church. We object to it, as seemingly intended to meet a case already in being; an ex post facto law warranted by no system of ethics, human or divine; because independent of the general rule, liable in its enactment to prejudice and partiality. We object to it as Romanizing in its tendencies in this; it seems to suppose that a simple majority may be infallible. Again; we object to the interpretation put upon it by the presenting bishops in this, they assume to act under it as Grand Jurors, thus merging their characters as Christian fathers and brethren into one of an ex parte, secret and inquisitorial tribunal; changing the parental government of the Church and the ends proposed by Christian discipline, for naked punishment in terror of other offenders, and converting children and brethren of a common household into strangers and foreigners. Again, we object to the construction put upon the canon by the court in this, that they allowed an organization under it, consisting in part of judges between whom and the accused there had been for years, if not an unfriendly feeling as men, at least on the part of his judges such manifestations as are wholly incompatible with strict impartiality, except on the principle of human infallibility. We object to the substitution plainly attempted to be made by the court of the common law in place of the Scriptures, for the interpretation of the meaning of the canon. We object to the judgment of guilty, as founded upon testimony evidently artificial; not being preceded or followed by corresponding acts and circumstances; and therefore unnatural and incredible. The cases supposed are such above all others, which may have originated in accident without motives of any kind most liable to misconception and misconstruction, and depending either way more than in any other conceivable case on the judgment, virtue, and intelligence, or the imagination, weakness, and caprice of witnesses. The present case is not analogous to one where circumstantial matters, all directly tending to support the main fact proven by one witness, are sworn to by others; nor are the court sustained by the uniform practice of civil courts in trials for perjury. The humanity of human laws in such cases so far conforms to the spirit of the divine law, that an attempt to introduce full proof of perjury at one time in support of a charge of perjury at another, would be met only with astonishment. The Court in the present case seem to have gone beyond this, in admitting a sort of half proof of one offence, in support of half proof of another.

If permitted to give a reason for the divine rule, requiring two or more witnesses to convict an Elder, we should offer this among others, that two witnesses to the same fact if false, would, if separately examined, generally convict each other, and if true, support each other. If the facts are distinct and independent of each other, two false witnesses might violate their oaths with impunity. We cite the case of the two false witnesses in the story of Susannah, which the Church, permits to be read for example of life. Still, we admit that any reasoning on the propriety of the rule given by inspiration to Timothy, is superfluous. What is written is written.

We except to the opinions given by the leading members of the majority of the Court, as manifesting a tone and spirit not in accordance with the marked and emphatic expressions of responsibilities to God and his Church, as therein expressed; and note some particulars, as follows:—The recital of Bishop Chase that he is the President of the Court, and presiding bishop, is without meaning, unless intended to give a fictitious weight to his vote, in the estimation of the Church at large, and thus unfeelingly intended more injuriously to affect the character of the defendant. His allusion to hasty expressions said to have been made by Dr. Higbee, seemingly basing his decision upon them, and his inability to discover the only natural interpretation of the entire testimony of Drs. Milnor, Muhlenberg, and Higbee, is open to but one melancholy conclusion. His citing the case of Eli's sons, seems rather intended to irritate the feelings of the defendant and his friends, than offered as applicable to the present case. His liberal quotations of Scripture to a case not in point, coming as it does from one of our spiritual fathers, while conforming so closely to the world's practices, is humilitating.—Truly, our oldest bishop must be blind indeed, in supposing that the crimes of Eli's sons are the crying sins of the clergy of our day. The sins of our age most prominent and alarming are, beyond question, bigotry and intolerance, envy and strife, intermeddling in other men's matters, being busy-bodies, over anxiety for proselyting, building up this or that mere man's parish or diocese, college, or school, in the name of the Church, and with little regard to means; love of power, mean and wicked truckling to the world, its fashions and caprices; distracting the attention of Churchmen from their own sins by waging fierce warfare with the errors and corruptions of Rome and the sects; flattering the rich for their money to build corner-lot churches, colleges and schools, for parties in the Church; helping to build up Rome, by uniting with the world in persecutions equally foolish and wicked; bowing down before the policy of aspiring politicians, who seem to demand the sacrifice of unpopular truths as the price of men's votes; appealing to popular prejudices and passions in the branding of other brethren with opprobious names and epithets. Certainly, every man of common observation and discretion, unwarped by prejudice, must be confounded that our oldest bishop should, with such elasticity, leap over the foregoing sins of the times, with lying and slandering, and make such furious onset on offences no more thought of before this extraordinary trial, than witchcraft or magic.

Of the written opinion of the Bishop of Vermont, it smacks so much more strongly of the merchant, lawyer, and politician than the Christian bishop; so much tinctured with that kind of ecclesiastical polity which is ever struggling to conform the government of the Church to some sovereign emperor, sovereign pontiff, sovereign king, or sovereign people; that the calling of any man's attention to it, seems superfluous.

We notice some features in the opinion of the Bishop of Rhode Island which appear so forcibly to paint the character of this whole proceeding, and to show to what strange absurdities well informed and sincere men may be brought, by equally strange influences, that we allow some space for it. This Prelate says in substance, that inasmuch as the defendant did not plead guilty, but put himself and others to so much trouble, he is entitled to no mercy; that if he had thus plead guilty, he would have been in favor of a simple admonition; but that under the circumstances true mercy to the defendant, and especially to the Diocese of New York, requires that he be deposed. He also says that the defendant does not deny the facts as alleged against him, and that he is his friend. In plain terms, and when set down at large, the first clause of the above should read thus:—"True, a portion of the Church has been in a feverish state for years, from causes connected with the defendant, but wholly foreign to the present case. True, an angry feeling has been produced against the defendant now admitted to be false, of heretical tendencies. True, all accusations for public and official sins in the defendant, having failed, the excitement and wrath produced by the attempt and failure, seems to have found vent, in an attempt to destroy his private character. True, it would seem that the case made by the record might be safely entrusted in a quiet and healthy state of feeling to a few neighboring Prelates, and that the inconvenient and unnecessary attendance of the bishops of Georgia, Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Illinois; indeed the tenor of this entire proceeding, is evidence of so much feeling, as to banish confidence in the minds of candid men. True, the Court are not agreed as to the guilt or innocence of the accused; that while six out of seventeen unequivocally believe him innocent, the remaining eleven are not unanimous as to all the charges; some pronouncing him guilty of nearly all, while others seem to be settled only as to one or two out of nine charges in the proceedings; showing conclusively that the whole case at best was involved in doubts. True, such is the charity even of the world, and such the wisdom derived from the experience of centuries, that the settled opinion of even one man out of twelve of the innocence of a defendant, is considered as raising such reasonable doubts, as to the guilt of an accused person, that no sentence can be pronounced on the judgment of the eleven associates. True, according to the testimony of Drs. Milnor, Muhlenberg, Wainwright, and Higbee, in relation to the only charge, not absolutely made ridiculous by the only witnesses called, nothing had occurred in their opinion which was not either incredible, or if credible in any shape, yet under such modifications as not to admit or require that the peace of the Church should be disturbed, or that its friends should present it in a false attitude, to provoke the jeers and scoffs of open infidels and the hypocritical compliments of secret enemies. Still, as eleven out of seventeen bishops, (some of whom have come so far as to see the end of the matter,) have concluded that the defendant some few years ago, if not now, was on the whole a bad man, it was his duty even if innocent to have anticipated their verdict, and thus saved Bishops Polk, Elliott, Otey, Freeman and Chase, from travelling so far, or remaining so long, to vindicate the Church in New York, especially the outraged feelings of the honorable gentlemen, Jay and Memminger, and the Rev. Messrs. Trapier and Richmond. Now if the defendant had anticipated our verdict as he was bound, I might have been in favor of simple admonition. It is now too late to repent of his contumacy; to make sure of his repentance hereafter, and in mercy to him and his diocese, let him be deposed."

The Bishop of Rhode Island may have been the personal friend of the defendant, but upon what principle he should have referred to it, is not apparent, without looking beyond the record. Such a suggestion, if in anticipation of his own defence at the bar of public opinion, is unfeelingly dragged in, and made at the cost of an elder brother. Nor can we discover by what rule the defendant is made to admit the facts as sworn to by witnesses, unless it should be required of a Christian bishop, to work himself into a passion, and after verdict, furiously denounce his triers; and his failure to do so, taken as an admission of his guilt. We should certainly suppose that the opinion of a majority, acting under the present canon, however false in fact, is yet after being duly pronounced, to be taken as true in some sense for the time being; and for the defendant to have treated it as otherwise, would have been a contempt, and evidence of such a want of humility, as is required of every man who hopes for mercy here or hereafter.

The published opinion of the Bishop of Connecticut seems past all comprehension, unless it is to be understood that one who has been so eminently successful in exposing the errors and absurdities of the sects, should pride himself too too much on the rapid increase and growing popularity of the Church in his own diocese, (the removal of the Seminary notwithstanding.) At any rate, he is evidently impatient, and viewing the charges brought against his brother of New York as a reproach upon his order, calls out for speedy relief, ordering a sort of half amputation, without appearing to have given one glance at a limb which for any reason by him given may be as sound as any other of the body.

We cannot but sympathise with any and every Bishop of New York at all times. This diocese has been, and is likely to be, the common plunder ground of every corner-lot gentleman who wishes to enhance the value of his property by a fine church, and a fine preacher; of every aspiring man, who can see no progress but in the multiplying of irresponsible schemes professedly for Church objects, and to be under the exclusive control of his own superior wisdom. Wo be to a Bishop of New York, who has not the stomach to embrace at once a whole swarm of beggars of all grades and casts; or who dares to close his diocese against a single great man, who may chance to be bursting under the mightiest conceptions.

There is trouble in store for every prominent individual in the Church, who dares to think, no matter how honestly, that such unity as is expressly enjoined by our Saviour, is of some importance; and that no such unity is attainable but upon the basis of one General Theological Seminary, under the control of the whole Church with branches if need be, subject directly to such seminary; that a half dozen men of mature age and some experience, of plain but substantial learning, well trained under the pastoral care and private teaching of a tried and well educated presbyter, will do more to build up that kingdom which is not of this world, than as many scores of vain, green young men hatched by a sort of steam process, and sent out by a green, hastily formed, and so called Seminary.

In conclusion of this whole matter. This proceeding, taken in all its connections, is so identified with a crises in the affairs of our branch of the Church, as to present the question of the guilt or innocence of the Bishop of New York, as a mere drop in the bucket. We do not wish to conceal our admiration of the man, or our belief of that however eminent his character in times past, the manner in which he seems thus far to have passed through the trying scenes of the last two years, in a degree not to be expressed, is a subject of devout gratitude to God, that the Church in our day has been presented with so striking an example of faith and patience, of Christian fortitude and humility—such reliance upon God. Nor are we unconscious of our sympathy for such a man and his family, or our grief that to arouse the Church from a state of apathy and insensibility, such sacrifices should be required. We have put the question to ourselves, who among us would not have shrunk from such a conflict; who, in a money-loving, popularity-seeking, philosophical and faith-wanting age, would not have fainted and sought peace at his soul's hazard? We know that good men have labored to convince themselves and others that Churchmen are agreed in all the essentials of Christianity. We know, however, it is quite otherwise; that the poles are not further apart than our clergy; not more in detail than in the whole; not so much in externals as in spirit; and the effect produced by their teachings on the hearts and lives of themselves, and of those under their charge. We know that there is evidence of a want of unity, of attempts to explain away, of struggles to be released from the plain standards of interpretations and rules of practice which our own branch of the Church has provided in its Book of Common Prayer. The questions now presented and forced upon the Church by this extraordinary trial, and which mere solemn form and imposing display have clearly failed to settle, are as follows:—Is the canon under which Bishop Onderdonk was tried, with the circumstances connected to serve as a model for future legislation? Is the same tribunal which finds the facts, to pronounce the judgment of the law? Is a bare majority to render a final judgment, with no provision for the correction of errors from false testimony, or infirmities of judgment, or temper, common to all men? Are the opinions and wishes of a minority to have no influence on the majority in fixing the grade of punishment? Is a secret and ex parte proceeding of three inquisitors to be taken as a precedent in all time to come, and put in practice on the same model against all our clergy and laymen? Is the practice to be countenanced by the Church, of the clergy and laymen of one diocese going into another, and hunting up testimony against the private characters of our clergy, of any grade? Are the opinions expressed, and the rules adopted by the Court in this case, to be approved and accepted as precedents?

For ourselves we say, that if this case had occurred in Ohio; if our own diocese and bishop were directly the afflicted parties, so far as this small parish could have any weight in shaping the course of Ohio, we should say at once, let us patiently and humbly remain where a Court formally organized under a canon of the Church had placed us, until the Church in some capacity had settled not only the above questions, but whether there is no remedy for an indefinite suspension, except in evading it by flight, or relief come by act of God in the natural death of the person suspended. A cold, worldly policy, coming no matter from what quarter, from an old or young presbyter, which under a specious cry of peace, seeks for the adoption of temporary expedients, and proposes to postpone the labor of settling principles on which the being of the Church may depend until there shall be another outbreak among the hundred dioceses in prospect, is, so we humbly conceive, of man's wisdom.

The history of Rome in its offensive sense, is a history of temporary expedients, and so is that of the world. It seems not in man seriously to set himself to work in any good thing, until forced to it. In the present emergency, nothing short of keeping before the Church a suffering diocese and a suffering bishop, precisely as placed by this melancholy proceeding, can, with a certainty demanded by the crisis, ensure such sober investigation, such understanding of the true character of a true Church, and of the merciful designs of afflictions and judgments, as shall force our rulers in the fear of God to provide adequate redress for the past, and preventives against like disasters hereafter.

We have had one resignation practically of even the office of Bishop in Ohio, but the end seems not yet. This was done, as we understand it, without canon or approved precedent, from personal considerations, from hasty views of temporary expediency, and however meant, in utter trifling of a solemn trust of express divine appointment. The committing of such offices to men, not angels, is, we humbly believe, in the spirit and after the model of a mysterious system of man's redemption, as planned by wisdom from above. One object seems for the trial of our faith and patience. We should tremble for ourselves if, by the slightest agency, we were without seeing pursued, step by step, every process required by a living faith, a long suffering and patient endurance, rashly to aid in an attempt to sever what God has joined, to release a bishop from his responsibilities, or the humblest member of his charge from consequent and relative duties. The slightest wavering from a practical faith may end in the rankest infidelity. The natural tendencies of all irreverence for the office of the Christian ministry in any of its grades, and the want of the largest Christian charity for the person and character of the incumbent, are mere man worship to-day, and murder to-morrow. While we then reverence the office of a bishop and presbyter, and within the utmost limits of the laws of the Church cover the faults of the incumbents in this diocese and the Church in this parish with the mantle of charity, we will strive to do our duty as a portion of their charge, in not only quietly submitting to all things lawful but in plainly warning them of all dangers within our knowledge which may threaten either their own persons, characters, and usefulness, or the substantial peace and health of a common family in Christ, in which if one member suffer, all must suffer with him. This we will do whether such dangers arise from their own sins as men of like infirmities with ourselves, or the sins of others; praying always that God in his continued pity would cleanse and defend his Church; that he would send down upon his bishops and other clergy, and upon the congregations committed to their charge the healthful spirit of his grace.

George Willard,	Elihu C. Strong,
Norman Seymour,	Robert Seymour,
David Warner,	Josiah Allen,
Geo. C. Loveland,	R. W. Griswold,
John Booth,	L. Tyler,

A FAMILY SCHOOL FOR BOYS.

THE subscriber has removed to Wilton, Connecticut, a very healthful, quiet, moral, pleasant village, with a view of enlarging his school, and will receive into his family a limited number of pupils to board and instruct in the various studies preparatory to entering College or upon the mercantile life. The government and instruction will be conducted by the subscriber in person, who will endeavor to develop the moral, intellectual and physical powers, each in due proportion and in harmony, to exercise watchfulness over his pupils with parental solicitude, and administer discipline with parental tenderness.

The expense of board, tuition, &c., the pupil furnishing his own bed, bedding, towels, napkins, books and stationery will be $75, payable in advance, for a term of five months, beginning on Thursday, the first of May, and ending with September.

D. H. SHORT.

References.—The Rt. Rev. Bishop Brownell, D.D. LL.D., Hiram Ketchum, Esq., Messrs. Morris Ketchum, Robert D. Weeks, Henry Trowbridge, S. J. Sylvester, William B. Ballow, and the clergy of the city of New York generally.

Wilton, Conn., April 1st, 1845.—4t

ST. MARY'S HALL.

IN approaching the close of the eighth year of this Institution, the Bishop of New Jersey acknowledges with gratitude the blessing from the Lord which crown his labors in its behalf. The term now current, for the first time, finds the building filled. Not to reject, at the next term, many of the numerous applications now received, an enlargement of the buildings will be necessary. This will be done without delay, in good time for the opening of the term; to the great improvement, as well as increase, of the present accommodations of the House. To meet the increased responsibility of greater numbers, and to give the fullest pledge of his devotion to a work, which has gained constantly upon his heart, and which is scarcely second in importance, to the Church and country, to any thing which he can do, the Bishop, on the first day of May, will go into St. Mary's Hall, as Rector, to take an important part in its instruction, as well as in its oversight and government. The Rev. Mr. Germain will continue to be the Chaplain and Head of the Family; and Mrs. Bishop, as heretofore, will be the Matron. Important improvements, in every department, will be made: and nothing spared, that faithful labors or that fervent prayers can do, to make it most effectual, with His blessing, as a nursery of the Church, to train up Christian women.

The regular course of instruction at St. Mary's Hall will include a Primary Department, and a Junior, a Middle, and a Senior Class. The studies of each of the three classes will occupy one year. Applicants will be admitted into the Primary Department, without examination, and at any age. Admission into any of the Classes will be granted to such only as sustain an examination on the studies which precede it. Those who complete the whole course, satisfactorily to the direction of the Institution, will receive, at its close, a testimonial to that effect.

The year is divided into two terms and two vacations. The Summer Term commences on the first day of May, and the Winter Term on the first day of November. The months of April and October are the vacations. Whole expense, for the term of five months, including every charge, except for Sheet Music, and drawing and painting materials $135, payable always in advance. The charge for each Vacation, to those who remain at the Hall, will be $10. No bill of any kind, to be contracted by, or for, the pupils.

Addresss the Rev. R. J. Germain, Chaplain, and Head of the Family, St. Mary's Hall, Burlington, New Jersey; to whom the earliest application should be made, to secure admission for the ensuing term.

Burlington, N. J., March 22, 1845—tM10.

SELECT BOARDING SCHOOL FOR BOYS, at Tarrytown, Westchester County New York.—William G. Weston, A. M., Principal.

In this Institution pupils are afforded the means of a thorough course of instruction in all the branches of an English and Classical Education, preparatory to college or commercial pursuits. It is strictly a family school, in which the pupils, being limitted in number, are, as far as practicable, regarded and treated, in every respect, as children of the Principal, and are constantly under his own personal care and instruction.

The location is highly eligible. Tarrytown is justly celebrated for its beautiful and romantic seenery, the perfect salubrity of its climate, and the elevated character of its citizens. It is twenty-seven miles from New York, and is visited every morning and evening by steamboats from the city.

The school is about one mile from the landing, and half a mile from the village, thus enjoying the advantages of perfect retirement, and ample grounds for exercise and recreation.

The Summer Term, consisting of 22 weeks, commences on the First Wednesday in May.

Terms.—For board, washing, mending, fuel, lights, and instruction in all the ordinary English branches, the higher Mathematics, and the Latin and Greek Languages, $75 per term, payable in advance. Circulars at the bookstores of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, 139 Broadway; Messrs. Raynor, Bowery; Messrs. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway.

References.—Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, Rev. C. D. Jackson, Rev. Geo. D. Sutton, W. Parker, M. D., C. R. Gilman, M. D., Stephen B. Tompktns, Esq., J. C. Baldwin, Esq., New York City. Rev. Dr. Creighton, S. Swartwout, Esq., N. B. Holmes, Esq., N. Bayles, Esq., Tarrytown. Feb. 22—June 1. $

FAMILY SCHOOL FOR BOYS.
New Hartford, Oneida County, N. Y.

THE undersigned, having removed to the spacious mansion of the late Judge Sanger at New Hartford, is now prepared to receive into his family a limited number of pupils.

The course of instruction embraces the Classics, Mathematics, and Modern Languages; and will prepare the student for College, or for active business. Vocal and instrumental music will be taught when desired.

The government shall be strictly parental.

The religious instruction of the family is under the general supervision of the Rector of the Parish. The academic year consists of two terms of twenty-two weeks each, commencing on the first day of September and February.

The expense for Tuition in all the branches of study, including Board, Washing, Books, Stationery, Drawing materials, &c. is $175 per annum. Without tuition in Music, Drawing, and the Modern Languages, the charge is $130 per annum.

References.—The Right Rev. W. H. De Lancey, Bishop of the Diocese of Western N. York; the Rev. B. Hale, D.D., President of Geneva College, Geneva; the Rev. J. C. Rudd, D. D., Rev. P. A. Proal, D. D., Rev. George Leeds, Utica; the Rev. Stephen H. Battin, New Hartford; the Rev. Wm. E. Eigenbrodt, New York city; the Rev. John W. Brown, Astoria, L. I.

June 29—yly W. H. PADDOCK.

ORGAN BUILDING.—THOMAS HALL, (formerly of Philadelphia, and more recently of the firm of Hall & Erben,) Church and Parlor Organ Builder, informs his friends and the public, that he is prepared to execute orders for ORGANS of every description, at his Manufactory, No. 86 Wooster street, near Spring, at short notice, and at reduced prices.

From the long experience the subscriber has had in the business of Organ building, he flatters himself he can furnish instruments of a quality at least equal to he productions of any other builders in the United States. Orders for Tuning and Repairing punctually attended to.

THOMAS HALL,
No. 80 and 86 Wooster street,
Dec. 9—yly. near Spring.

ORGANS.—The subscriber offers for sale the following Organs, viz:

One of 10 stops, Grecian case, 12 feet 6 inches high, 8 feet 6 inches wide, and 7 feet deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt. One octave of Pedal pipes.

One of 8 stops, 11 feet high, 7 feet 3 inches wide, and 4 feet 6 inches deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt.

Two of 6 stops, 10 feet 6 inches high, 6 feet 6 inches wide, and 4 feet deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt.

Two of 5 stops, 9 feet 5 inches high, 6 feet wide, and 3 feet 9 inches deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Three of 4 stops, 8 feet 6 inches high, 5 feet 6 inches wide, and 3 feet deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Six of 3 stops, 7 feet 6 inches high, 5 feet 4 inches wide, and 2 feet 6 inches deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Also two elegant parlor organs, in Mahogany polished cases.

Also a dumb organ. This is a piece of Machinery that can be attached to, or removed from, the keys of any organ without difficulty. They are operated on by a Crank, similar to a Barrel Organ, and can be made to play any music required.

HENRY ERBEN,
Sept. 7. Centre street, head of Canal st.

FRENCH AND ENGLISH SCHOOL.

REV. C. H. WILLIAMSON, Rector of the French Episcopal Church *Du St. Sauveur*, has made such arrangements as will enable him to receive into his family six young ladies, in order to finish their education in the *French* language, of which department he will take the entire charge.

Any young lady, not having completed her studies, either in music, singing, drawing, or any of the English branches, will have the advantage of continuing them in Mrs. Williamson's *Day School*, which has been established for the last eight years.

New York, April 12, 1845, 72 Murray street.

Western Episcopal Bookstore, Louisville, Ky.

S. K. GRANT, Bookseller and Stationer, No. 20 Market street, Louisville, keeps constantly on hand a good and general assortment of Theological, school, and miscellaneous books, and fancy stationery; all the leading Church publications, including those of the Sunday School Union, may be had at the lowest prices; and he respectfully appeals to the clergy of the Church, not only for their own custom, but to recommend their friends who may be coming to the city to give him a call. April 5—2m

Church Cushions, Pulpit Furniture, &c.

THE subscribers would respectfully inform Building Committees and members of churches that they are prepared to execute orders for Cushions, Lining and Stuffing of Pews, Benches, and making of Furniture for and Trimming of Pulpits and Desks, of every kind of material used for the purpose, of different styles, at moderate prices, and at the shortest notice.

W. & G. CURTIS, Upholsterers in general,
Aug. 3—tf No. 52 Maiden Lane.

THE AMERICAN HARP.—A Collection of new and original Church Music, under the control of the Musical Professional Society in Boston, arranged and composed by Ch. Zeuner, organist to St. Paul's Church and to the Handel and Haydn Society.

Extract from recommendation of Musical Society.

"Having our profession at heart, we trust Mr. Zenner's work will have an extensive circulation, convinced that it will give satisfaction not only to the profession itself, but also to the liberal amateur, and to any congregation where music forms a part of worship."

Feb. 15—3m ALEX. V. BLAKE, 77 Fulton st.

ORGAN BUILDING.—Mr. Jardine, Organ Builder, of New York, has just completed and put up in the Roman Catholic Church of Norfolk, Va., a large and superior Instrument of his manufacture. It surpasses my expectation in its compass, melody and decorations. In bearing cheerful testimony to his beautiful fabric, I am happy to add that I have derived unmixed pleasure from my intercourse, official and social, with the meritorious artist.

A. L. Hilselberger,
Pastor of St. Patrick's R. C. Church, Norfolk.
Feb. 19, 1845.

It affords us much pleasure in adding our testimony to the above.

P. H. Masi, Organist of the Church.
W. D. Delany, Mayor of Norfolk.
B. M. Miller, Rector of St. Paul's Ch. Do.
W. Southgate, Cashier Exch. Bank of Va.
P. P. Mayo, Attorney at Law, &c. &c.

The above Instrument contains 21 Stops, 2 sets of Manuals and Pedal Bass to CCC 16 feet.

To clergymen and gentlemen about furnishing their Churches with organs, Mr. Jardine respectfully solicits their orders. March 1

AN APPEAL AND REVIEW.—An Appeal from the Sentence of the Bishop of New York, by Justice, second edition.

To which is added a Review of the Trial of Bishop Onderdonk, by Amicus Veritatis, from the Buffalo Commercial Advertiser of February 18.

JAMES A. SPARKS,
Churchman's Bookstore, 161 Fulton st.,
March 29. opposite St. Paul's.

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY

THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, Depository, No. 20 John street, New York.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

Union Primer,	per hundred	$3 00
Prot. Epis. Sunday School Book, No. 1,	"	1 38
" " " No. 2,	"	1 75
" " " No. 3,	"	2 00
" " " No. 4,	"	5 00
Questions on the Sunday School Books,	"	5 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,)	"	1 38
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 50
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,	"	5 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	3 00
Church Catechism,	"	1 25
First Truths,	"	2 50
Duty to God,	"	0 50
Church Primer,	"	1 38
Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children	"	1 75
Harmony of the Creeds	"	2 25
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 25
Collects from the Prayer Book	"	2 00
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism on the Collects	"	25 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	8 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2, stiff covers	"	10 00
Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	20 00
" " Vol. 2, New "	"	22 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers,	"	10 00
" " 2, " "	"	9 00
" " 3, " "	"	10 00
Questions on The Acts, 1, "	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	8 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child,	"	2 50
Beavens' Help to Catechising	"	10 00

☞ A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

The Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Library, 81 vols. 18mo.—reduced price to poor schools, $12.

The same, bound in 151 volumes of various prices. Total, $21 83 nett.

The Children's Magazine, bound in 32 volumes of 144 pages each, price for the set, $6 63 nett.

The Juvenile Library, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 85 cents nett.

☞ Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to

DANIEL DANA, Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John street.
New York, April 6, 1844.

Agents for the Churchman.

Portsmouth, N H—Rev Charles Burroughs, D. D. and George M Marsh.
Burlington, Vt—N A Tucker, Esq.
Middlebury, Vt—Harmon A Sheldon.
Boston, Mass—Charles Stimpson.
Providence, R I—Samuel C Blodget, bookseller.
Pawtucket, R I—David Le Favour.
St Albans, Vt—G G Smith.
Quincy, Florida—Rev Josiah Perry.
New Haven, Ct—Croswell & Jewett, booksellers.
Hartford, Ct—Henry S Parsons.
Philadelphia, Pa—George & Wayne, bookseller.
Albany, N Y—W C Little, Esq.
Catskill, N Y—Charles B Pinckney.
Saratoga Springs, N Y—Stephen B Nash, Esq.
Schenectady, N Y—A A Van Voorst.
Troy, N Y—Young & Hartt.
West Troy, N Y—George H Lewis.
Lansingburgh, N Y—Alex. Walsh, Esq. (gratis.)
Poughkeepsie, N Y—Ebenezer C Arnold.
Hudson, N Y—Milo B. Root.
Newburgh, N Y—William Purdy.
Auburn, N Y—Thomas C Miller.
Geneva, N Y—George M Hills.
Utica, N Y—Isaiah Tiffany.
Watertown, N Y—J F Hutchinson, Esq., P. M.
Unadilla, N Y—A B Watson.
Oswego, N Y—Henry Adriance.
Buffalo, N Y—W B & C E Peck, booksellers.
Fayetteville, N Y—D L Farnham, Esq.
Newcastle, Delaware—Hon. James Booth.
Baltimore, Md—H Colburn.
Chaptico, Md—J Biscoe, Post Office.
Princess Ann, Md—Wm W Johnston, Esq., P. M.
Alexandria, D C—Bell & Entwistle.
Norfolk, Va—George Rowland, Esq.
Richmond, Va—Joseph Gill.
Wilmington, N C—A A Brown, Esq.
Charleston, S C—A E Miller.
Augusta, Georgia—G McLaughlin.
Louisville, Ky—Solomon K Grant.
Lexington, Ky—William Iucho.
Marietta, Ohio—Arius Nye.
Cleveland, Ohio—Lewis Handerson.
Quincy, Illinois—Henry H Hoffman, Post Office
Chicago, Illinois—John H Kenzie, Esq.
Jackson, Michigan—P E Demill, Esq.
Homer, Michigan—Rev E O Hodgkin.
St. Louis, Missouri—R P Williams.
Natchez, Miss—Brevoort Butler.
Mobile, Ala—S. W. Raymond, and J. M. Conley.
Halifax, N S—Joseph H Graham, bookseller.